

The Quality of Life in the  
Master of Education Program, Brock University

Marilyn R. J. Ellis, B.A., O.P.N.

Department of Graduate and Undergraduate  
Studies in Education

Submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Education  
Faculty of Education  
Brock University  
St. Catharines, Ontario



May, 1992

## Abstract

This study addressed the problem of the quality of life in the Brock Master of Education program. Survey and interview data were used to gain an understanding of satisfaction with the learning achieved and student life experienced.

Eighty-seven percent of the study sample reported satisfaction with the program overall. Results suggested the higher the overall satisfaction with a program, the greater the likelihood learning and student life satisfaction were also more positive. Student reflections suggested satisfaction with the quality of life in the program was associated with the program's focus on the student, the use of self-directed learning, and the support of professors to meet student needs.

Comparison of the Brock Master of Education survey with the Brock Pre-Service Teacher Education program showed both student groups shared a similar satisfaction with student life in the Faculty. Comparison of Master of Education programs suggested the difference between two programs, a difference which may be influenced by time in the program. The results from the three programs suggested that

students beyond the first undergraduate degree favored the school domains of learning acquisition. Supplementary data on the relationship between cognitive and affective opinions suggested the more positive the affective dimension of learning, the greater the likelihood the cognitive dimensions of student life were also more positive.

It was concluded that time was a chief factor influencing part-time student satisfaction with both learning and student life in the program. Part-time students, as the majority in the survey, expressed comments about the need for clarity of communication between the organization and student to promote the effective use of limited time.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to all of my fellow students who participated in this research and offered their candid opinions of what made life satisfying or not so satisfying. Thanks are extended to Rod Clifton at the University of Manitoba for permission to use both the instrument and unpublished report data in this work. Finally, thanks go to my advisors who offered valid criticisms.



## Table of Contents

	Page
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Tables	vii
 CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM	 1
Background	1
Research Questions	3
Rationale	4
Scope and Delimitations of the Study	4
Outline of Remainder of Document	5
 CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	 6
Background	6
The Role of Schools	7
Assessment of the Quality of School Life	10
Perceptions of the Quality of Life	13
The Conceptual Perspective	13
The Opinion Perspective	14
Overall Satisfaction	16
Domain-Specific Satisfaction	17
Global Satisfaction	18
The Reflective Perspective	20
Limitations in Quality of Life Research	22
Review of Quality of School Life Research	23
High School Quality of Life	24
University Quality of Life	27
Summary	29
 CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	 31
Research Methodology	31
Research Design	32
Context of Instrument	33
Meaning of Instrument Categories	33
Measurement of Results	35
Population Description	38
Instrument	40
Data Collection and Recording	42
Data Processing	45
Limitations	46
Restatement of the Problem	48

	Page
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS	49
Survey of the Brock Master Program	49
Background Characteristics	50
Overall Opinion of Satisfaction	56
Gender Satisfaction	58
Enrollment Status Satisfaction	62
Subject Area Satisfaction	67
Study Location Satisfaction	73
Reflections of Brock Master Students	79
Background	79
Overall Satisfaction	81
Learning Satisfaction	84
Student Life Satisfaction	88
Enrollment Status Satisfaction	92
Subject Area Satisfaction	96
Study Location Satisfaction	102
Other Unlisted Categories	105
Education Program Comparisons	107
Supplementary Findings	112
Summary	112
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION	118
Summary	118
Discussion	119
Overall Satisfaction	119
Learning Satisfaction	120
Student Life Satisfaction	125
Variable Satisfaction	130
Other Categories	137
Education Comparisons	139
Supplementary Findings	141
Implications for Research	142
Implications for Practice	144
Conclusions and Recommendations	146
References	148
Bibliography	159
Appendix A: Research Correspondence	162
Appendix B: Detailed Survey Results	171

List of Tables		Page
Table 1:	Brock Master of Education Survey Characteristics	51
Table 2:	Brock Master of Education Respondent Work History	53
Table 3:	General Background Aspects of Brock Master Respondents	55
Table 4:	General Opinion of Satisfaction with the Brock Master of Education Program	57
Table 5:	Background Aspects of Respondents by Gender	59
Table 6:	Opinions of Satisfaction by Gender	60
Table 7:	Background Aspects of Respondents by Enrollment Status	63
Table 8:	Opinions of Satisfaction by Enrollment Status	65
Table 9:	Background Aspects of Respondents by Subject Area	68
Table 10:	Opinions of Satisfaction by Subject Area	70
Table 11:	Background Aspects of Respondents by Study Location	74
Table 12:	Opinions of Satisfaction by Study Location	76
Table 13:	Population Characteristics of Education Programs	108
Table 14:	Opinions of Satisfaction by Education Programs	110
Table 15:	Patterns of Cognitive (C) and Affective (A) Opinions	113

## CHAPTER ONE: THE PROBLEM

This research focuses on the quality of life in the Brock Master of Education program. Quality of life was assessed in terms of learning and student life satisfaction.

### Background

A Master's degree offers students the opportunity to gain subject knowledge mastery, socialization into the role of researcher, preparation to enter doctoral studies, and achievement of work-related goals (Jacobson, 1983). In recent years, the enrollment into Master programs has increased (Potts, 1989). One difficulty with increasing enrollment, especially in Master of Education programs has been the paucity of research about the quality of programs (Hopkins & Ried, 1984). The purpose of this research was to inquire into the quality of life in the Brock Master of Education program. Assessing the quality of a program by using quality of life is appropriate (Downey, 1988; Fincher, 1983).

There is a paucity of research about Master or Master of Education programs. Evidence of the scarcity of Master research was found in the paper by

Peterson, Cameron, Jones, Mets and Ettington (1986). In their review of teaching and learning in university, where over five hundred research papers were used, not one article was referenced to a Master level program. It has been suggested that what contributes to the limited research about Master level programs is the lack of a single degree, the lack of single curricular model, and the need for a multidimensional assessments (Glazer, 1988).

The investigations of the quality of life in Master level programs is also limited. Six university studies were identified that focused on the quality of life. Three American studies offered an overall general review of factors influencing satisfaction with undergraduate and doctoral students (Amos, 1988; Denton, Tsai & Chevrette, 1987; Holzemer & Chambers, 1986) while three Canadian studies focused on the quality of life in Education programs (Boak & Ellis, 1991; Bulcock, Mendoza, Crane & Lee, 1989; Clifton, Jenkinson, Marshall, Roberts & Webster, 1987). The paper of Clifton et al. (1987) was the only research identified that addressed the issue of Master of Education quality of life. There was then, a knowledge need for this research. The intent of this

investigation was to offer information about student satisfaction in one Master of Education program, the perspective satisfaction was considered from, and what supports or detracts from student satisfaction.

### Research Questions

In this particular study the questions to be asked about the quality of life are as follows. First, Brock Master of Education program: (a) What were the population characteristics of survey participants? (b) From survey data, what was the quality of life (overall, learning, student life) in the program? (c) From survey variables, what similarities and differences occurred in the quality of life in the program? and (d) From student reflections, what was said about the quality of life in the program?

Second, education program comparisons of the Brock Master of Education, Brock Pre-Service Teacher Education and Manitoba Master of Education programs: (a) What similarities and differences occurred across and between the general population characteristics? and (b) What similarities and differences with the reported quality of life occurred across and between the different programs?

Third, supplementary findings of cognition and affect: (a) What patterns of cognition and affect emerged from all survey data? and (b) How was the principle of cognitive and affective opinions supported in this research?

#### Rationale

The use of satisfaction with the quality of life permits the tracing of a group's normative opinions of satisfaction about known and evaluated aspects of life (Andrews & Withey, 1976). Opinions of satisfaction provide insight into a program's success in meeting student aspirations and expectations (Perry, 1970). The resulting data offers information about program areas needing decision-maker attention (Axelrod, 1990; Sell, 1989).

#### Scope and Delimitations of the Study

Progress in the understanding of any subject comes from finding out what can be ignored and what cannot (Goodwin, 1947). The scope of this study was aimed at providing information about the environment of learning and the student life experienced by students. The research was designed to offer an assessment of one Master of Education program at one

point in time. Comparisons of education programs offered an opportunity to gain a sense of the similarities and differences in the learning and student life satisfaction between programs. Reporting cognitive and affective opinion patterns provided a description of the relationship of each when related to learning and student life.

#### Outline of Remainder of Document

Chapter Two provides background of school life and satisfaction with Master programs. A discussion of the instruments used to measure quality of school life is followed by a the perspectives being measured by quality of life and a review of related quality of school life research.

Chapter Three outlines the methodology used, a detailed research design, data collection, data analysis and methodological assumptions.

Chapter Four presents the results of the Brock Master of Education survey and student reflections. Outside comparison of the three education programs is followed by the supplementary data.

Chapter Five offers a brief summary of preceding chapters, a discussion of findings, implications and recommendations.



## CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides background information on the role of schools and factors that may influence Master student satisfaction. The concept of quality of life is discussed from a social indicator perspective followed by a review of quality of school life research.

### Background

The assessment of the quality of life (QOL) from the perspective of the student in school has been distinguished in both social indicators and educational research (Bharadwaj & Wilkening, 1980; Cherlin & Reeder, 1975; Vermunt, Spaans & Zorge, 1989; Williams & Batten, 1981). In research, the assessment of the quality of life in school has also been labelled quality of school life (QSL). As a measure, QSL is oriented toward adults and offers a means of assessing and evaluating existing environmental conditions (Isherwood, Ahola, Hammah & Sullivan, 1979). The data which emerges from an assessment of the quality of school life provides an opportunity to trace satisfaction with both formal and informal aspects of schools (Batten & Girling-Butcher,

1981), and information to decision-makers about a school's ability to meet the academic, educative and independent learning needs of students (Epstein & McPartland, 1976; Williams, 1981). The opinions students offer about the quality of life in school reflects their perceptions of the power they have over what good is gained (Ainley, Reed & Miller, 1986).

### The Role of Schools

One role of schools is that of institutions of learning. In general, schools expect students to assume responsibility for the knowledge to be learned (Popkewitz, 1977). However, the amount of learning responsibility transferred to students varies between schools. The variations in learning responsibility transfer was suggested to reflect the different school philosophies of learning, and how individual expectations are integrated into program strategies (Worthen, 1990).

The transfer of learning responsibility may be influenced by both teachers and students. Teachers, and the curriculum they present, are important to student acceptance of learning responsibility and satisfaction with school (Wolf, Chandler & Spies, 1980). Teachers promote student satisfaction and

acceptance of learning responsibility through the style of teaching used, the learning approach presented in class, and the importance they give to students as individuals (Batten & Girling-Butcher, 1981; Fry & Coe, 1980). Student acceptance of learning responsibility has been suggested to be influenced by a student's learning motivation, how the student perceives the relevancy of the curriculum, and the support perceived available from teachers (McCombs, 1991). Isherwood et al. (1979) noted that when students felt they could approach teachers with problems, response about the quality of school life were more favorable than when students sought help from other students.

#### Master Level

Universities, as institutes of higher learning, focus on the development of knowledge through research, the exchange knowledge through classes, and support for the greater needs of society (Avi-Itzhak, 1985; Thomas, 1983). The environment of a university is made up of an administrative bureaucracy, a fraternity of academicians creating and/or imparting knowledge, and students striving to gain an understanding of that knowledge (Campbell, Fleming,

Newell & Bennion, 1987)). From a functional organizational level, what may influence reports of satisfaction are how the university perceives its role as either a place of learning excellence or research (Amos, 1988), how professors are assessed and evaluated (Furnham, 1990), and what bureaucratic restrictions limit the relationship between graduate students and professors (Haley, 1989).

At the staff level, what seemed important to graduate student satisfaction was the relationship possible with professors. The relationship of the professor and graduate student was linked to the learning approach used and the support professors offered to students, both inside and outside of the classroom. The learning approach graduate students suggested was most satisfying in meeting their diverse needs was independent learning (Jacobson, 1983).

In the classroom, professor support was perceived as providing time for peer interaction opportunities (Girves & Wemmerus, 1988), using adult learning principles to promote an environment free from authoritative structure, and helping students establish learning goals (Schmidt, 1983). Outside of the classroom, professors were seen to support

students through the roles of organizational climate setters and guides. As climate setters, professors gave first-hand realistic representation of what graduate study was about, offered a sense of acceptance of students as colleagues, and provided students with an opportunity to observe scholarly research behavior (Bargar & Mayo-Chamberlain, 1983; Stein & Weidman, 1989). As guides, professors assisted students to understand their new roles as researchers and independent learners (Jacobson, 1983).

Students also contributed to satisfaction with the quality of life in a program through past educational experiences (Stein & Weidman, 1989), acceptance of the role of independent learner (Fincher, 1983), enrollment selection as either part- or full-time (Girves & Wemmerus, 1988), and their motivation to finish a program (Britton, 1986),

#### Assessment of the Quality of School Life

The instruments developed to measure student opinions of QSL were designed to assess specific grades, schools, or systems. Their design purpose was to assess the environmental and organizational features that support student aspirations and

expectations (Wentzel, 1991).

The grounding of QSL instruments is in the research of Epstein and McPartland (1976). The instrument they developed assessed student feelings of overall satisfaction with school, the positive social involvement of the student with the tasks of school life, and the student's ability to fulfill their potential. This instrument was used across different grades, schools and geographic locations.

A second instrument by Williams and Batten (1981) focused QSL from a student life perspective. Student life aggregated values and beliefs of individuals about a school's climate (global satisfaction) and student attitudes to self and aspects of school (school domains). Measurement of satisfaction with the quality of school life incorporated the dimensions of subjective well-being and school domains. The results of testing provided data about institutional patterns and beliefs. Analysis of the measurement constructs through case analysis suggested a confirmation of the fit between items and the theoretical constructs of quality of life satisfaction (Batten & Girling-Butcher, 1981).

A third instrument by Roberts and Clifton (1987) was designed to relate university institutional learning goals to student experiences in classrooms. Opinions of satisfaction with the quality of school life were approached from three directions. First, a single question asked students to offer an opinion of their overall satisfaction with the program. Second, opinions of satisfaction with learning used the conceptual constructs in the taxonomy of Bloom and Krathwohl (1956). This taxonomy classified educational learning into three levels of objectives: (a) cognitive, which assess the recall of knowledge and the development of intellectual abilities and skills; (b) affective, which focuses on changes in the abilities, interests and values of students; and (c) psychomotor, which relates to the motor skills being developed. In this instrument the dimensions of cognition and affect were used. Third, the research of Williams and Batten (1981) was used to assess opinions of student life satisfaction.

In the dimensions of learning and student life, the cognitive and affective opinions examined asks individuals to think of two different aspects of school life. At the level of learning, cognitive

opinions direct individuals to think of and evaluate learning on more than one level; affective opinions focus on the emotional aspects of learning which influenced a students learning motivation (Magolda, 1987; Shuell, 1986). At the level of student life, affective opinions reflect the perceived environment of a school; cognitive opinions focused on the emotional and social support experiences within the domains of school (Williams & Batten, 1981).

#### Perceptions of the Quality of Life

What quality of life (QOL) means is dependent upon the perspective from which a life situation is being assessed. In research, assessment of QOL has been approached as: (a) a concept which focuses on an individual's perceptions of subjective well-being; (b) an individual's opinion of satisfaction with some life situation; and (c) an individual's reflections about some life situation.

#### The Conceptual Perspective

As a concept, QOL lacks both theoretical and technical meaning on its own (Schuessler & Fisher, 1985). It provides a focuses for an individual's thoughts toward expectations of objective conditions



and aspirations of subjective values in a life domain (Andrews & McKennell, 1980; Andrews & Withey, 1976; Campbell, 1976; Diener, 1984; Glatzer & Mohr, 1987; Liu, 1975). Szalai and Andrews (1980) suggest QOL reflects the existential view an individual gives to categories or groups in a life domain. From an existential perspective, quality suggests the conscious measurement of the sense of excellence gained from a life experience; life provides a set time for an individual to reference the good gained in a life domain (Barnes, 1968; Greene, 1967; Gruba-McCallister, 1991).

#### The Opinion Perspective

Opinions about the quality of life incorporate responses to the concept of subjective well-being (Bradburn, 1969). What opinions reflect are the conscious and unconscious measurement of the extent to which personal aspirations and expectations were achieved in a life situation (Campbell & Converse, 1980; Cherlin & Reeder, 1975). Responses offer insight into the perceived discrepancy (gap) between what was thought should be, to what is in a life situation (Abbey & Andrews, 1985; Andrews & Withey, 1976; Michalos, 1983). The structure of this gap was

suggested to be a function of the power an individual believed they had over ensuring some good was experienced in a life situation (Burt, Wiley, Minor & Murray, 1978). Research showed opinions of QOL may be measured as happiness (Vermunt et al., 1989), satisfaction (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Campbell, 1976), or goal accomplishment (Hankiss, 1980).

The most frequently used measure in research was satisfaction. It was described as a measurement term that provided an opportunity for individuals to reference and measure life experiences from a perspective most people strive to achieve (Chamberlain, 1987; Glatzer, 1987). Inglehart & Rabier (1986) suggested satisfaction provided an individual with a real world focus from which to assess goal achievements, the aspirations met in specific circumstances, and the desirability of a life situation to meet expectations. Moreover, it was suggested that the term satisfaction permitted an individual to independently evaluate the positive and negative experiences of life; individuals may convey a high opinion of satisfaction about positive aspects of life and simultaneously convey less favorable opinions when responding to questions directed toward some

negative aspects of life (Bradburn, 1969; Bradburn & Caplovitz, 1965; Costa & McCrae, 1980; Glatzer, 1987). The result, a means by which normative opinions offered about a life situation across time and data may be traced (Abbey & Andrews, 1985).

Satisfaction, then, is a measure that offers the means by which an individual may offer an opinion about feelings which may vary over time (Atkinson, 1982; Glatzer, 1987; Yardley & Rice, 1991). The validity of using satisfaction to rate a life situation has been suggested to be reasonably consistent of an individual's views over time (Campbell & Converse, 1980). In QOL research, satisfaction has been described from three perspectives: overall (general), domain-specific (cognitive) and global (emotional, affective) (Diener, 1984). Although each is presented separately in terms of the meaning given each in research, an individual's opinion of overall satisfaction encompasses a consideration of both domain-specific and global satisfaction (Abbey & Andrews, 1985; Yardley & Rice, 1991).

#### Overall Satisfaction

Overall satisfaction offers a comprehensive

assessment of opinions about what was gained in a life situation (Emmons & Diener, 1985). Its focus provides an evaluation of the interaction between current situational perceptions and the individual's expectations and aspirations of the situation (Blishen & Atkinson, 1980; Campbell, 1981; Glatzer, 1987). Reaching a consensus of overall satisfaction involves the assessment of the level of positive emotion and does not consider only the absence of negative emotion experienced (Diener, 1984). The opinion expressed reflects an individual's emotional satisfaction with objects or elements of a life domain situation that influence achievements (Abbey & Andrews, 1985; Andrews & Withey, 1976; Coan, 1989). What was not clear in research was whether domain satisfaction resulted from emotional satisfaction; it was suggested that emotional satisfaction does not cause domain satisfaction (Andrews & Withey, 1976).

#### Domain-Specific Satisfaction

Evaluated as a distinguished part of life, domain satisfaction was suggested to consider the difference between an individual's aspirations and expectations (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Glatzer, 1987; Vermunt et al., 1989). Domain opinions involve a division of

life situations into separate but related domains, assessment of feelings of satisfaction with each, then combining the feelings of satisfaction with each domain to gain a sense of overall satisfaction (Diener, 1984; Schuessler & Fisher, 1985). How domain satisfaction may be reached is dependent upon the way an individual perceives and evaluates the gap between what their set standards of life in a domain situation are, to what was perceived as possible in the situation (Andrews, 1981; Andrews & Inglehart, 1979; Michalos, 1983).

#### Global Satisfaction

Global, emotional and affective satisfaction were used interchangeably in research and literature to suggest the means by which an individual assessed opinions of the positive and negative support qualities experienced in an environment (Bradburn, 1969; Glatzer, 1987). Satisfaction from this perspective reflects an individual's comparison of the positive experiences gained in a life situation to the negative experiences received (Coan, 1989; De Haes, Pennink & Welvaart, 1987; Schneider, 1986). Opinions reached about global satisfaction were reported to consider the occurrence of positive

emotions and the absence of negative emotions (Bradburn, 1969; Diener, 1984; Szalai & Andrews, 1980). Research suggested that positive and negative emotions have a correlation in the mind of an individual when evaluating a life domain experience; repeated negative emotions may lower the potential for an individual to experience positive feelings (Brenner, 1975; Kammann, Farry & Herbison, 1984).

Quality of life opinions are reported from a group perspective. The aggregation of individual opinions to present a group overview permit a comparison of similarities and differences of the normative opinions of the group. Findings have been discussed in terms of the nature of patterns of satisfaction in and between groups, how a single group when compared to other groups differ, and how satisfaction appears when contrasted between two or more variables across groups (Andrews, 1980; Hankiss, 1980; Scheer, 1980). Assessing satisfaction from a group perspective permits an establishment of the norms prescribed by a group and knowledge of the structure of well-being before analyzing individual differences (Burt et al., 1978).

A pattern noted about satisfaction responses was that the smaller the gap between aspirations and expectations, the higher the reported opinion of satisfaction; the wider the gap, the lower the reported opinion of satisfaction (Abbey & Andrews, 1985).

### The Reflective Perspective

Reflecting about the quality of life in a situation provides a view of the nature of individual existential attitudes about the relationship of the environment to the individual (Bradburn, 1969; Campbell, Converse & Rodgers, 1976). Existential attitudes reflect what an individual experiences in a life situation (Levitt, 1987). Individuals may focus on the development of personal freedom, the centrality of love and caring from others, the ability to cope with the stress and strains of everyday life, and problems with self-actualization and obstacles to it (Goodstein, 1987). Attitudes are cognitive and affective beliefs held about a life situation which prompt favorable or unfavorable opinions of an object, person, event, or institution (Ostram, 1969 cited in Andrews and McKennell, 1980). A belief is the subjective knowledge an individual

holds about themselves and their environment (Davis & Ostram, 1987).

### Cognitive and Affective Beliefs

Individuals use differing combinations of cognition and affect to rationally and emotionally measure their subjective well-being in a life situation (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Campbell, 1981; De Haes et al., 1987; Veenhoven, 1988). Cognitive beliefs reflect an individual's perceptions about a life situation object; affective beliefs permit an individual to express a like or dislike of an object or persons in relation to their satisfaction with the limitations and freedoms of a life situation (Andrews & McKennell, 1980; Glatzer, 1987). In research, the use of separate categories for cognitive and affective opinions has resulted in a lack of agreement about how an individual distinguishes between the two (Diener, 1984). What appears to be of primary concern is the degree of overlap between each as they impacted on an individual's measurement of life quality. However, regardless of opinion controversy, it has been suggested that both be used to compare the satisfaction expressed by individuals (De Haes et al., 1987).



A pattern of cognition and affect discussed in research was that the more favorable the emotional responses, the greater the likelihood the cognitive responses are also more favorable (Andrews & McKennell, 1980; Arlin & Withey, 1978; Weiner, Russell & Lerman, 1979).

#### Limitations in Quality of Life Research

Three limitations most frequently presented in regard to quality of life research are as follows. First, the closer and more immediate the domain is to an individual's personal life, the greater the influence the domain has on the individual's perceived satisfaction with it (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Campbell et al., 1976). Second, the more positive an individual's responses to experiences in a life situation, the less distinct are their recollections of what was positive or negative in the situation (Beiser, 1974; Bennin, Stock & Okun, 1988; Bryant & Veroff, 1982; Zevon & Tellegaen, 1982). Third, time in a program influences the situational familiarity of respondents and their opinions of satisfaction (Herzog, Rodgers & Woodworth, 1982). Time also influences the cohesion of opinions of individuals in a group. The paradox of inter-group

variation suggests that the more time spent in a group, the more an individual's opinion of satisfaction reflects the groups (Campbell et al, 1976; Inglehart & Rabier, 1986).

#### Review of Quality of School Life Research

There was limited research available in literature that surveyed learning and/or student life in relation to student opinions of the quality of school life. The research to date provides exploratory assessments and evaluations of student opinions about what was satisfying, less satisfying, and of concern to students. Most notable at the level of high school were the findings from Australia by Ainley et al. (1986), Batten and Girling-Butcher (1981), and the development work of Williams and Batten (1981).

At the level of university, four studies were identified which addressed QSL. Each approached QSL using the instrument of Roberts and Clifton (1987). The studies, all from Canada, are by Boak and Ellis (1991), Bulcock et al. (1989), and Clifton et al. (1987).

### High School Quality of Life

The research of Williams and Batten (1981) provides background for student life item development and meaning. The report provides the theoretical support of items and their placement into four school domains (status, identity, teachers, opportunity). Discussion of note focused on the domains of teachers and opportunity. Items in the domain of teachers were reported to be more plausible to students when the greater part of student time in school involved interaction with teachers. Items of opportunity which were perceived as capturing the sense of student competence with school, were: (a) doing well enough to be successful; (b) reaching a satisfactory work standard; and (c) knowing how to cope with work.

The research of Batten and Girling-Butcher (1981) supported the work of Williams and Batten (1981) through case analysis of student responses from seven high schools. The purpose was to provide a profile of the usefulness and validity of student life items. Subjects were identified by the high and low satisfaction responses from survey results. Survey results, when integrated with interviews provided a

clearer picture of the meaning of instrument items.

First, higher satisfaction scores were reflected by more favorable opinions across all dimensions of student life; lower satisfaction scores were reflected in less favorable opinions across all dimensions. From case notes, it was suggested more favorable comments were reported by students in schools that encouraged learning independence, by students who were higher in the school system, and when students perceived curriculum was more relevant in preparing students for their futures.

Second, the variation of satisfaction responses between groups were noted as differences in student perceptions of school approaches to learning, teachers support of students, and year of student study.

Third, students responded more favorably about teacher items, even when reporting less favorably to other items. Case notes suggested differences in satisfaction with teachers were dependent upon the school being surveyed and the student's year in school.

Fourth, students favored either the domains of social development (status and identity) or learning

acquisition (teachers and opportunity). The domains were described by the authors as richer sources of information than global satisfaction items.

Comments about the domains suggested several pertinent points: (a) status was perceived as the freedom given students by a school; (b) identity was reported as reflecting a school's support for student learning independence and flexibility in relation to course selection and timetable development; (c) teachers, when perceived as approachable and interested in students, were discussed in more positive terms; and (d) opportunity was discussed in more positive terms when the curriculum was perceived as more relevant to students and when students took part in class discussions.

Three general comments of note were made. First, females were more positive in opinions than males. Second, the more favorable responses to items of opportunity, the more positive were opinions of overall satisfaction. Third, opinions from ex-students differed when compared to students currently enrolled in school; current students favored the support given students while ex-students favored the intrinsic worth of schools.

The research of Ainley et al. (1986) sampled students of 53 secondary schools in Australia. The study explored the relationship between aspects of the school organization, teacher job satisfaction, and student opinions of the quality of school life. Findings suggested satisfaction was more favorable: (a) in the domain of opportunity when curriculum recognized the diverse aptitudes of students and when classes were perceived as coordinated to one another; and (b) in the domain of teachers when communication between teachers was frequent. Females were again reported more positive in opinions than males. Time in school was linked to a perceived relevancy of curriculum which was associated with the opportunity items of: (a) the things I learn are worthwhile; and (b) I am given a chance to do the work that really interests me.

#### University Quality of Life

The research of Clifton et al. (1987) was an assessment of the quality of life in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. The study involved a random sampling of current undergraduate Teacher Education and Master of Education students. The results suggested student opinion of satisfaction

with the quality of life in their respective programs was low; however, Master students expressed more favorable opinions of satisfaction than undergraduate students.

The research of Bulcock et al. (1989) from Memorial University of Newfoundland surveyed a random sample of current undergraduate Teacher Education students. The results when compared to Manitoba Teacher Education students suggested Memorial students expressed higher levels of satisfaction across both dimensions of learning and student life. Less favorable opinions of learning satisfaction focused on items described by the authors as important to teaching. Student life concerns focused on teachers who were seen in a negative way and not as role models who were trusted or respected.

Finally, the research of Boak and Ellis (1991) from Brock University was based on a voluntary return mail retrospective survey of Pre-Service Teacher Education students. Results suggested more favorable opinions of satisfaction were held by the students of Brock across learning and student life dimensions, when compared to each of the results from Manitoba and Memorial. In contrast to Memorial students,

Brock students reported teachers as people who were caring and nurturing.

#### Summary

The meaning of the quality of life is dependent upon the perceptions of the individual being surveyed. Quality of life focuses an individual's thoughts toward the good gained good in a life situation. What influences opinions of satisfaction are the favorableness of attitudes about objects, people, or organizational features in a life environment; the more favorable the attributes, the more favorable an individual's opinions of satisfaction. Opinions of satisfaction express the distance between aspirations achieved and expectations met in a situation; the smaller the gap between aspirations and expectations, the more positive the satisfaction. Group opinions offer an opportunity to examine an individual group member's satisfaction in relation to a norm established by the group.

The quality of school life research suggested student satisfaction may be influenced by a school's environment, organizational processes, and students themselves. Environmental influences were reported



as the philosophy of the school toward learning, location of study, communication, curriculum year and the coordination of classes. The relevancy of the curriculum to students and teachers were two organizational processes that influenced opinions of satisfaction. Student reflections suggested QSL satisfaction was related to class participation, peer affiliations, knowing teachers were interested, being able to establish learning goals and being able to approach teachers for help. Student influences on QSL opinions were related to the motivation to learn, perceptions of the support available, year (time) in school, gender, learning values, commitment to studies, learning independence and flexibility. Two limitations which emerged from QSL research were time in school and research population type.

In review, investigating the quality of life in the Brock Master of Education program provided an opportunity to develop an understanding of what it meant to one group of students, the perspectives from which it was measured, and factors which influenced the opinions expressed.

### CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the methodology, research design, selection of subjects, data collection and processing, used to investigate student opinions of the perceived quality of school life are presented.

#### Research Methodology

This research was focused on investigating student perceptions of satisfaction with the quality of life in the Brock Master of Education program. Assessment of the program was approached through a survey that asked students to offer cognitive and affective opinions of the learning satisfaction achieved and student life satisfaction experienced. Research about the program, through student self-reflection, offered information useful to decision-makers about what students perceived was satisfying, where the program did not meet the expectations of students, and what organizational considerations should be given to enhance the quality of life experienced by students. Interview and commentary also provided a means to assess the generalization of organizational and student influence on satisfaction with the quality of school life that were presented in Chapter Two.

Descriptive statistics were used to develop an analysis of the relationship between non-manipulated variables in the research. Data were also divided into cognitive and affective response groupings to observe an opinion pattern noted in research when applied to learning and student life.

### Research Design

This descriptive assessment and evaluation research was designed to answer the question of the quality of life in the Brock Master of Education program. Opinions of satisfaction were obtained using both survey and self-reflective methods. A reported limitation when reporting research about the quality of life for a population was a lack of standardization with the context, meaning and measurement of results (Andrews, 1980; Scheer, 1980).

To provide a valid and precise method of data description, definitions of domains and sub-sets within the instrument are presented. The formulae developed to assess the quality of life in the Brock Master program and comparative assessments use definitions from the perceptual measures of the quality of life presented in Chapter Two.

### Context of Instrument

Clifton et al. (1987) based the philosophy and belief of learning satisfaction on four premises: (a) programs are often framed in terms of goals and instruction; (b) goals of instruction are often thought of in terms of a typology of education objectives; (c) instruction at university must be aimed at many goals, knowledge, or facts; and (d) instruction at university must be concerned with higher forms of knowledge, skills, interests and values.

Williams and Batten (1981) made the assumption that both authority-based and power-based feelings which arise in the satisfaction of student's expectations, contribute to the development of student perceptions of the quality of school life.

### Meaning of Instrument Categories

The definitions used in this research to describe results are as follows. First, the domain of learning satisfaction represents the learning goals of an institution. Learning objectives were phrased to generate an evaluation of the learning experienced by an individual in terms of: (a) Cognitive opinions, which expressed an evaluation of learning across six

dimensions (knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, evaluation); and (b) Affective opinions, which expressed the emotional (value complex) aspects of the learning world experienced which influenced student learning motivation.

Detailed definitions of the learning objectives are found in the research of Roberts and Clifton (1987).

Second, student life satisfaction represents the beliefs a student holds about the support from the environment of the school to themselves and aspects of school, in which the subsets: (a) Global satisfaction was the perceived positive and negative supports of the environment of the school, the subset satisfaction was the positive experiences gained and the subset dissatisfaction was the expression of negative experiences received; and (b) Domain-specific satisfaction opinions expressed the support (emotional and social) experienced in school, in which its subsets were status (freedom given to students in school to interact with others), identity (school's support of learning independence), teachers (the support of students and their learning), and opportunity (relevancy of the curriculum to support student needs). Detailed

definitions of subsets within student life are found in Batten and Girling-Butcher (1981), Clifton et al. (1987), and Williams and Batten (1981).

### Measurement of Results

A measurement model was developed to produce a systematic assessment of the survey results of the quality of life in a school program. The model and its formulae incorporated the theoretical meaning of subjective well-being in terms of its expression of satisfaction. The presentation of the formulae was not intended to imply mathematical or scientific precision but to clarify how data were aggregated. The term function of (F) was used to express the relationship between the dimensions of learning and student life and each of their defined subsets.

The assumptions upon which the formulae were built are: (a) the theoretical structures which generated items were correct; (b) the theoretical structures of satisfaction and cognitive-affective process were correct; and (c) life quality opinions are a function of aggregating normative opinions about life experiences in a life domain (school); normative opinions, in a psychological sense, represented the average number of students responding

to items and the mean of responses to items when aggregated into respective subsets.

The formulae to follow reflect the definitions of how individuals gain a sense of satisfaction opinion with each of the domain-specific and global aspects of the quality of life, reported from literature in Chapter Two. In the domain of learning satisfaction, cognitive and affective learning objectives were placed in a hierarchical model. Literature supports the placement of cognitive and affective reports of learning into a hierarchy and research suggests hierarchies serve an investigative purpose (Dunn & Taylor, 1990; Vermunt et al., 1989; White & Gagne, 1974).

#### Learning Satisfaction (LS)

This domain, as an expression of Cognitive Learning (CL) and Affective Learning (AL), was represented by the set:

$$LS = [(CL + AL)/2]; \quad (1)$$

where the subset of Cognitive Learning was represented by:

$$CL = [(K + C + Ap + An + S + E)/6]; \quad (2)$$

which was a member of the set LS; K Knowledge, C Comprehension, Ap Application, An Analysis, S Synthesis, and E Evaluation were subsets within CL that held elements distinctive to each; and where the subset of Affective Learning was represented by:

$$\underline{AL} \ E \ (\underline{VC}); \quad (3)$$

which was a member of the set LS; VC value complex was the sole subset of AL and held elements distinctive to it.

#### Student Life Satisfaction (SLS)

This domain, as an expression of Global Satisfaction (GS) and Domain-Specific Satisfaction (DS), was represented by the set:

$$\underline{SLS} \ E \ [(\underline{GS} + \underline{DS})/2]; \quad (4)$$

where the sub-set of Global Satisfaction was represented by:

$$\underline{GS} \ E \ [(\underline{PS} + \underline{DD})/2]; \quad (5)$$

which was a member of the set SLS; PS positive Satisfaction and DD disagree Dissatisfied were subsets within GS that held elements distinctive to each; and where the subset of Domain-Specific



Satisfaction was represented by:

$$DS = E [(S + I + T + Q) / 4]; \quad (6)$$

which was a member of the set SLS; S Status, I Identity, T Teachers, and Q Opportunity were subsets within DS and held elements distinctive to each.

#### Population Description

Administrative factors, multiple locations, multiple streams of study, confidentiality of student information, and time in the program were major limitations to using a random selection of subjects. A population of voluntary respondents was more practicable. A total of 783 students were reported by the Registrars Office to be registered in the Brock Master of Education program in the winter study term (January to April) of 1991. Mailing labels from the office of the Registrar permitted a return mail survey to be sent to 745 students in May of 1991. Due to the time of year and a large proportion of students being part time (97.6%), a slow rate of return was expected (Moss, 1981). The second request for responses was delayed until August; however, an unforeseen mail strike required a request to be made

through class announcements in September.

A full description of the survey population is presented in Table 1 of Chapter Four. The return rate for questionnaires was 375 (50.3%); the final number included in the data set were 370 (49.7%). A total of 149 (40.3%) of respondents offered voluntary commentary when returning instruments. Although students who responded voluntarily to the survey may not have reflected the characteristic of the whole group, respondents provided representation for each of the variables of the research.

The percentage representation description which follow reflected the percentage of the total overall population in the program. The survey population breakdown was as follows: (a) gender, 283 (51%) of all females and 86 (38.2%) of all males in the program responded; (b) enrollment status, 16 (89%) of 18 full-time and 354 (46%) of 765 part-time students responded; and (c) subject area, Foundations 101 (55%) of 184 students, Curriculum 140 (46%) of 307 students, Administration 107 (41%) of 259 students, and Adult Education 21 (68%) of 31 students. The study location populations represented where students attended the majority of courses. The

number of students attending locations were not available from the office of the Registrar; therefore, nominal data for each campus were reported: 135 students attended Park Royal, 90 attended Dundas/McMaster, 119 attended Brock, and 25 attended Seneca/Sheridan.

#### Instrument

Roberts and Clifton (1987) initiated the design of the instrument to provide a self-reported measure of student satisfaction with university life quality. The instrument was divided into three parts: A single question on overall satisfaction, twenty-seven questions about learning satisfaction, and forty questions on student life satisfaction. Respondents were asked to select their answers from a five-point Likert-type scale of definitely agree, mostly agree, neutral, mostly disagree and definitely disagree.

Items on the Manitoba questionnaire were written to reflect Teacher Education students. In this research, the stem of each item question was retained so as to limit any change in the meaning of questions; the descriptor was changed to reflect opinions of students in a Master program which was more appropriate for the Brock population. The revised

descriptions were reviewed by five individuals for clarity.

Questions of student entering characteristics were developed by this researcher to gain personal data about Brock Master of Education students. The areas focused on were: (a) General -- enrollment status, stream of study, location of study, return distance to school, number of courses completed, motivation, exit paper expectations and future education expectations; (b) Work Status -- place of work, work status, work tasks and years of teaching; and (c) Personal -- gender, age and background.

#### Validity and Reliability

Content validity is concerned with the degree to which items represent the content that the test is designed to measure (Borg & Gall, 1989). Content validity was suggested by a panel of judges comprised of undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty at the University of Manitoba. A set of items was agreed upon for each of the dimensions that seemed to have both face and sampling validity (Roberts & Clifton, 1987, 1991). Reliability is the degree of consistency of the instrument to measure whatever is being measured (Best & Kahn, 1989). The

internal consistency for the instrument in this research was as follows for: (a) the 27 items in Part A, using the unequal-length Spearman-Brown test, .9159; and (b) for the 40 items in Part B, using the equal length Spearman-Brown test, .9443.

#### Data Collection and Recording

Survey data were collected using a mail-out mail-back approach. All instruments were returned to a mail box separate from the university. Date of return was noted and any means of identifying respondents was removed. Numbers were assigned to instruments at time of data processing. Voluntary commentary provided with returned questionnaires was transcribed verbatim, excluding personal and specific program names. Throughout the research, this researcher had sole access to raw data. At the completion of the research all parts of the questionnaires were destroyed.

#### Interviews

The purpose of the interview was to obtain students comments about experiences in the program. The objectives were: (a) to identify themes that students considered when assessing their quality of

life in the Brock Master program; (b) to support the validity of the instrument; and (c) to gain a sense of what was satisfying about the program for students and/or what students suggested required decision-maker attention. The interviews were supplemented and supported by voluntary comments offered by 149 students.

Five interview subjects were selected from the students who expressed a willingness to be interviewed. The criteria for selection was based on the four subject areas. Eight potential interviewees were contacted to gain the five interviews. In the initial selection of subjects all who agreed were female; one male subject was selected to offset this bias. Dates, times and place of interview were set by the interviewees.

The characteristics of the interviewees were as follows: (a) one from each of Foundations, Curriculum, and Adult Education, and two from Administration; (b) three expressed satisfaction with the program, two were less satisfied; (c) course numbers varied from three to ten, the average number being six; (d) two of the interviewees attended full time, three part time; (e) three

attended the Brock campus, one Seneca, and one had split courses between Brock and McMaster.

Prior to the interview, all subjects were given a written consent form to read and sign. Interviewees were consenting to a taped interview and the use of the material in this thesis. Each interview, ranging from thirty to ninety minutes, was placed on a tape inscribed with the date, time, and pseudonym assigned to each interviewee. All interviews were transcribed verbatim and sent to interviewees for confirmation and changes. All requests for changes were complied with. Tapes were held by the researcher and were destroyed at completion of the research.

During the interview, students were asked to reflect on their life experiences in the Master of Education program in terms of a story. The use of the narrative method permitted interviewees to focus primarily on the qualities experienced in life (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990). It also provided an opportunity for interviewees to tell intrinsically meaningful information (Bernstein, 1990). Four interviews were conducted face-to-face. One interview was conducted via telephone due to distance and at the request of the interviewee. A

non-directive supportive positive relationship was presented by the researcher during the interview process.

#### Data Processing

Survey data were processed using frequency counts to gain a description of student satisfaction across the total program and then across each of the variables of the research (subject area, enrollment status and study location). The five levels of responses were then collapsed into three measurements: agree (definitely and mostly agree), neutral and disagree (mostly and definitely disagree). Results were reported in terms of satisfaction.

The frequency counts of items distinct to each of the domains of learning (seven) and student life (six) were moved into appropriate subsets and mean scores with standard deviations were calculated for each. Data from each variable set and comparative surveys were processed in this manner. Items between Education programs were assessed for similarity before calculations were performed. All items were checked three times for accuracy of placement and scores.



The Chi square test was applied to the data to test the independence of variables and to estimate the likelihood that sampling error did not account for the apparent relationships which emerged. Lack of cell size in the tables precluded obtaining valid results.

Analysis of qualitative data involved five steps after all data were transcribed verbatim for each individual who offered voluntary comments and from interview data. First, a coding system was developed which considered comment regularity and patterns, emerging topics, amount of data available and the variables being explored. Second, coding considered the context being examined (satisfaction), how the setting was described if presented, the perspective comments were being written from, and if some units of data applied to more than one category. Third, coded data were then separated into their own categories. Fourth, each category was re-read for patterns and themes before writing commenced. Fifth, writing considered the focus of this paper.

#### Limitations

First, the lack of theoretical and technical meaning of the quality of life created a difficulty for its measurement. The linkage of quality of life

to the theory of subjective well-being (satisfaction) provided a means to trace the relationships in surveys across student opinions, but not state their opinions.

Second, the averages presented have some error of measurement in relation to the possible accumulation of error resulting from each individual's interpretation of questions and when the ratings were aggregated to create averages. Caution must be taken when reviewing the averages as precise numbers.

Third, interpretation of qualitative data were influenced by the researcher's individual attributes and the perspective of the study.

Fourth, the opinions and concerns reported represent opinions at one point in time. Opinions change over time, as do concerns about organizational support and processes.

Fifth, the qualitative findings were limited by the low percentage of Brock Master of Education students offering opinions.

Sixth, the stability of meaning of satisfaction across education groups varied, which limited the inferences when outside comparisons were made.

### Restatement of the Problem

This research addressed the question of the quality of life in the Brock Master of Education program. Restating the problem into an interrogative statement: What do Brock Master of Education students say was the quality of life experienced in their program?

## CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

This chapter reports the results of the survey and reflections of Brock Master of Education students followed by outside comparisons and supplementary data.

### Survey of the Brock Master Program

The opinions of satisfaction reported in this Chapter represents the aggregation of student opinions found in Appendix B. The results reported in tables reflect the formulae presented in Chapter Three. Satisfaction was the only category included in tables in order to make results easier to understand and interpret.

Six percent was selected to distinguish satisfaction results; greater than 6% was reported as a difference when comparisons were made across and between subsets and groups, 6% or less was reported as a similarity in satisfaction. Although 6% was an arbitrary number, it was analogous to the average difference in responses across data sets for overall, learning and student life opinions. In each of the tables the global satisfaction subset dimension of disagree dissatisfied was labelled not dissatisfied

due to space constraints.

The survey population presented in this data represented 50% of all students enrolled in the winter school term of 1991. The population characteristics of the survey participants were as follows: The average age of respondents was 38 years; 69% of respondents reported an English background. Notable in the category of "Other" were 8% of respondents who indicated their background as Canadian. These students requested researchers to include the "Canadian" label in surveys as it was considered a valid identity and also due to respondent ancestral residency of more than five generations.

#### Background Characteristics

Table 1 reviews the population characteristics of gender, enrollment status, subject area and location of study that were outlined in Chapter Three. Table 2 outlines the work history of respondents. Full-time employment was reported by 84% of respondents. Seventy-nine percent of all respondents reported being employed in a formal educational institution, 47% of whom worked in elementary schools. The job of classroom teaching was reported by 60% with health and related social services accounting for 8% of jobs.

Table 1. Brock Master of Education Survey  
Characteristics.

Population	Number
Students in program (January-April, 1991)	783
Students excluded from survey	38
No mailing labels received	37
Researcher	1
Students sent instrument	745
Survey Data	
Instruments returned	375
Incorrect address	1
Returned incomplete	4
Instruments included in data set	370
Questionnaire voluntary comments	149
Gender	
Females	
Total number of females (program)	558
Total number of females (data set)	283
Representation of females in program	51%
Males	
Total number of males (program)	225
Total number of males (data set)	86
Representation of males in program	38%
Enrollment Status	
Part time	
Total number of part time (program)	765
Total number of part time (data set)	354
Representation of part time students	46%
Full time	
Total number of full time (program)	18
Total number of full time (data set)	16
Representation of full time students	89%

Table 1. (Cont'd.)

Population	Number
Subject Area	
Foundations	
Total number in Foundations (program)	184
Total number in Foundations (data set)	101
Representation of students in Foundations	55%
Curriculum	
Total number in Curriculum (program)	307
Total number in Curriculum (data set)	140
Representation of students in Curriculum	46%
Administration	
Total number in Administration (program)	259
Total number in Administration (data set)	107
Representation of students in Administration	41%
Adult Education	
Total number in Adult Education (program)	31
Total number in Adult Education (data set)	21
Representation of students in Adult Education	68%

Table 2. Brock Master of Education Respondent Work History.

Item	No.	Percentage	*
Place of Work			
Formal Institutions			
Elementary School	174	(47.0)	
Secondary School	38	(10.3)	
Separate Schools	28	( 7.6)	
Private Schools	8	( 2.2)	
Post Secondary	46	(12.4)	
Other	70	(18.9)	
Not Reported	6	( 1.6)	
Work Status			
Full Time	312	(84.3)	
Part Time	33	( 8.9)	
On Leave	7	( 1.9)	
Not Reported	18	( 4.9)	
Work Tasks			
Classroom Teaching	220	(59.6)	
Administration	71	(19.2)	
Consulting	26	( 7.0)	
Health Services	30	( 8.2)	
Not Reported	22	( 6.0)	
Years of Teaching			
1 to 5 years	54	(14.6)	
6 to 10 years	81	(21.9)	
11 to 15 years	53	(14.3)	
16 to 20 years	58	(15.7)	
21 plus years	55	(14.8)	
Not Reported	69	(18.7)	

\*

n Percentage of total population in each category.



Respondents with six to ten years of work represented the largest group in the category of teaching experience.

Table 3 presents a brief examination of the different aspects of personal life reported by respondents. The motivation to enter the program was similar; 47% entered for instrumental reasons and 46% for intrinsic reasons. At the time of the survey, 88% of respondents rated their motivation as high and 67% indicated their motivation was not linked to course work. Comments offered with data reported what influenced motivation when linked to course work was how professors presented themselves to students and how the course work was presented. Course work was associated with the degree of interest it stimulated in the student and the percentage of time spent on student presentations.

The project route as the exit paper expected to be used to complete the degree reflected a trend over time when data from previous years were reviewed. Finally, 75% of respondents reported the Master degree was the last degree in their education and 23% expected to move toward doctoral study.

Table 3. General Background Aspects of Brock Master Respondents.

Item	No.	Percentage	*
Motivation To Enter Program			
Instrumental Values	175	(47)	
Promotion opportunity	117	(67)	
Principals course	35	(20)	
Pay increase	23	(13)	
Intrinsic Values	171	(46)	
To gain knowledge	151	(88)	
Self-satisfaction	20	(12)	
Motivation Rating in Program			
High	325	(88)	
Moderate	15	( 4)	
Low	30	( 8)	
Motivation Related to Courses			
Yes	109	(29)	
No	246	(67)	
Not Reported	15	( 4)	
Expected Route of Program Completion			
Project	255	(69)	
Thesis	63	(17)	
Uncertain	52	(14)	
Future Education Expectations			
Master Degree	277	(75)	
Doctoral Study	86	(23)	
Other	7	( 2)	

\*

n Percentage of population in each category.

### Overall Opinion of Satisfaction

The following survey data reports student opinions of overall, learning, and student life satisfaction. The overall survey results provide a normative opinion of the satisfaction experienced by students. Table 4 shows that 87% of respondents were satisfied with the program overall; 81% reported satisfaction with learning and 79% satisfaction with student life.

### Learning Satisfaction

Satisfaction with the goals of learning increased as opinions about objectives higher in the learning hierarchy were assessed. The lowest satisfaction response was reported for the objective of knowledge (66%), the highest for evaluation (85%). The emotional aspects of school life that influence learning motivation (value complex) was satisfying for 85% of respondents.

### Student Life Satisfaction

The beliefs of respondents about the support of the program varied between subsets and across groups. Satisfaction with the support of the environment in the program was similar; 76% were satisfied with the positive experiences gained and 79% with the absence of negative experiences received.

Table 4. General Opinion of Satisfaction with the  
Brock Master of Education Program.

Item	N =	370
		(%)
Overall		87
Learning		81
Knowledge		66
Comprehension		73
Application		76
Analysis		78
Synthesis		82
Evaluation		85
Value Complex		85
Student Life		79
Satisfied		76
Not Dissatisfied		79
Status		71
Identity		81
Teachers		85
Opportunity		87

In the four domains of school, the freedom given to students by the school to interact with others (status, 71%) differed in satisfaction from each of the three other domains. Similar satisfaction was reported for the support of learning independence (identity, 81%), the support offered by teachers to students and their learning (85%), and the relevancy of the curriculum to support student needs (opportunity, 87%). Overall, the domains of learning acquisition (teachers and opportunity) were favored; curriculum opportunity above teachers.

#### Gender Satisfaction

In Table 5, a general description of gender backgrounds are presented. Across background aspects, each gender reported similar responses. Motivation was rated high by 89% of females and 84% of males, while 29% of females reported motivation was linked to courses compared to 33% of males. Future education expectations for each group focused on the Master degree as being their last: females (74%) and males (78%). Forty-seven percent of females had completed six or more courses compared to 52% of males.

Table 6, shows the similarities and differences in satisfaction with the quality of school life for

Table 5. Background Aspects of Respondents By Gender.

		Females	Males
Item	n =	283	86
Motivation Rating			
High		89%	84%
Medium		4%	6%
Low		7%	10%
Motivation Related to Courses			
Yes		29%	33%
No		68%	63%
Not Reported		3%	4%
Future Education Expectations			
Master Degree		74%	78%
Doctoral Study		24%	20%
Other		3%	2%
Courses Completed by Respondents			
1-5		43%	30%
6-10		47%	52%
Not Reported		10%	18%

Table 6. Opinions of Satisfaction by Gender.

Item	n =	Females, %	Males, %
		283	86
Overall		89	81
Learning		82	74
Knowledge		66	63
Comprehension		75	67
Application		74	64
Analysis		79	76
Synthesis		85	74
Evaluation		87	79
Value Complex		87	77
Student Life		81	75
Satisfaction		78	69
Not Dissatisfied		80	77
Status		72	67
Identity		83	75
Teachers		85	84
Opportunity		89	82

females and males. Male and female opinions differed for overall and learning satisfaction, but were similar for student life. Overall satisfaction was reported by 89% of females and 81% of males, while learning satisfaction for females was 82% and for males 74%. Student life satisfaction for females was 81% and males 75%.

#### Learning Satisfaction

Satisfaction with the learning achieved for each gender was inconsistent the higher objectives were in the learning hierarchy. Females expressed higher satisfaction with the objectives of comprehension, application, synthesis and evaluation than males. Subsets similar in satisfaction between gender were knowledge and analysis. Satisfaction with the emotional support aspects of school that supported learning motivation was different; females (87%) and males (77%).

#### Student Life Satisfaction

The beliefs each gender held about the environment of the program to support their needs varied. The emotional (global) support qualities of females and males differed. Satisfaction with the positive support experiences in school was rated higher by



females (78%) than by males (69%), while satisfaction with the absence of negative experiences was similar for each: females (80%) and males (77%).

In the domains of school, satisfaction with the emotional and social support experiences varied between gender. Satisfaction with the freedom given to each gender by the school to interact with others (status) was similar: 72% for females and 67% for males. The support of independent learning (identity) was rated differently by females (83%) than males (75%). The support offered to each gender by teachers was rated similarly by both: females (85%) and males (84%). Satisfaction with the opportunity of the curriculum to support student needs differed: females (89%) and males (82%). Each gender favored the domains of learning acquisition; males favoring teachers above opportunity.

#### Enrollment Status Satisfaction

Background aspects of part- and full-time students are presented in Table 7. Similar opinions of general motivation, motivation related to courses, and gender distribution, were reported between part- and full-time students. Females predominated in each of the groups. Two areas of difference in

Table 7. Background Aspects of Respondents By Enrollment Status.

	Part Time	Full Time
Item	n =	
	354	16
Motivation Rating		
High	88%	83%
Moderate	5%	5%
Low	7%	12%
Motivation Related to Courses		
Yes	29%	33%
No	67%	67%
Not Reported	4%	0%
Future Education Expectations		
Master Degree	76%	56%
Doctoral Study	22%	44%
Other	2%	0%
Gender Distribution		
Females	77%	72%
Males	23%	28%
Courses Completed by Respondents		
1-5	46%	27%
6-10	42%	72%
Not Reported	12%	1%

background aspects were reported for the future educational expectations of students and the number of courses completed. Part-time students indicated 76% saw a Master degree as their final degree, while 44% of full-time students reported a doctoral degree was expected. Second, the number of courses completed between each group differed: 46% of part-time respondents completed five or less courses and 72% of full-time had completed six or more courses.

Table 8 shows the similarities and differences in satisfaction with the quality of life for part- and full-time students. Part- and full-time student opinions differed for the dimensions of overall and learning satisfaction, but expressed similar opinions about student life. The difference in satisfaction were: overall (part-time, 87%; full-time, 94%) and learning (part-time 80%; full-time, 90%). The similar satisfaction expressed about student life was: 79% for part-time and 82% for full-time.

#### Learning Satisfaction

Full-time student satisfaction with the learning achieved did not consistently increase as responses to objectives moved up the learning hierarchy: Knowledge (88%) was rated higher than either comprehension (69%)

Table 8. Opinions of Satisfaction by Enrollment Status.

Item	n =	Part Time, %	Full Time, %
		354	16
Overall		87	94
Learning		80	90
Knowledge		65	88
Comprehension		73	69
Application		75	81
Analysis		78	88
Synthesis		82	91
Evaluation		85	89
Value Complex		84	95
Student Life		79	82
Satisfaction		75	85
Not Dissatisfied		80	63
Status		70	82
Identity		81	88
Teachers		85	92
Opportunity		87	98

and application (81%). Part-time students reported increasing satisfaction with the learning achieved, the higher objectives were in the hierarchy. Differences in satisfaction with learning objectives between part- and full-time students were reported for knowledge, synthesis and analysis; full-time students reporting higher satisfaction than part-time.

Satisfaction with the emotional support aspects of school (value complex) differed between full-time (95%) and part-time (84%) students.

#### Student Life Satisfaction

Student beliefs about the support gained from the program varied between groups. The emotional (global) support qualities for part- and full-time students differed. The assessment of the positive support experiences were satisfying for 75% of part-time and 85% of full-time students. There was also a difference in satisfaction with the absence of negative emotions experienced in the environment (part-time, 80%; full-time, 63%).

In the domains of school, opinions of the emotional and social support perceived by part- and full-time students differed across the four domains. Satisfaction for the freedom given students to

interact with others (status) was 82% for full-time and 70% for part-time students. The support for learning independence (identity) was 81% for part-time and 88% for full-time students. Satisfaction with the perceived support of teachers for student learning was 92% for full-time and 85% for part-time students. Finally, satisfaction with the support of the curriculum to meet student needs (opportunity) was 98% for full-time and 87% for part-time students. Both groups favored the domains of learning acquisition.

#### Subject Area Satisfaction

Four subject areas were identified in the program: foundations, curriculum, administration and adult education. The adult education area was a new special program apart from the mainstream of the Master of Education program; consequently, this subject area may be a different sample.

General background aspects of respondents are reported in Table 9. Across subject areas, general motivation, course related motivation and future educational expectations varied. The motivation of students decreased across subject areas: Foundation students reported the greater percent of high motivation (94%) and adult education the lowest

Table 9. Background Aspects of Respondents by Subject Area.

		F	C	A	AE
Item	n =	101	140	107	21
Motivation Rating					
High		94%	87%	83%	78%
Moderate		1%	5%	6%	11%
Low		5%	8%	11%	11%
Motivation Related to Courses					
Yes		31%	26%	33%	33%
No		65%	71%	63%	63%
Not Reported		4%	3%	4%	4%
Future Education Expectations					
Master Degree		67%	86%	73%	52%
Doctoral Study		33%	14%	23%	43%
Other		0%	0%	4%	5%
Gender Distribution					
Females		87%	76%	66%	81%
Males		13%	24%	34%	19%
Courses Completed by Respondents					
1-5		42%	39%	36%	57%
6-10		50%	49%	51%	43%
Not Reported		8%	12%	13%	0%

Note: (F = Foundations; C = Curriculum; A =  
Administration AE = Adult Education).

percent (78%). The report of motivation being linked to courses was higher for groups which suggested their future educational goal was doctoral study. The percentage of males in courses varied, the greatest number were in administration. A difference between the established subject areas (foundations, curriculum and administration) and the pilot project (adult education) was the number of courses completed by respondents: 57% of adult education students had five or less courses, while the average number of courses beyond five was 50% for the established programs.

Table 10 shows the similarities and differences in satisfaction for the four subject areas. In the established subject areas overall satisfaction was similar for foundations (96%) and curriculum (87%), but differed for administration (80%). Learning and student life satisfaction for the established subject areas were similar.

In the pilot project, overall satisfaction (76%) was similar to the established subject area of administration (80%), but differed from foundations (96%) and curriculum (87%). Learning and student life satisfaction for adult education differed from the



Table 10. Opinions of Satisfaction by Subject Area.

Item	n =	F, %	C, %	A, %	AE, %
		101	140	107	21
Overall		96	87	80	76
Learning		84	83	78	68
Knowledge		72	65	63	55
Comprehension		74	76	72	51
Application		78	77	76	54
Analysis		79	79	77	70
Synthesis		85	83	80	74
Evaluation		88	87	82	78
Value Complex		89	87	81	72
Student Life		82	81	78	71
Satisfaction		77	76	76	64
Not Dissatisfied		81	81	78	71
Status		75	71	68	61
Identity		84	83	77	73
Teachers		86	87	84	80
Opportunity		89	88	86	83

Note: (F = Foundations; C = Curriculum; A =  
Administration; AE = Adult Education).

three established subject areas.

Across the four subject areas, as overall satisfaction decreased, reported satisfaction with learning and student life also decreased.

#### Learning Satisfaction

Satisfaction with the objectives of learning was similar across established subjects and different for adult education. Within the established subjects, satisfaction with learning objectives increased as responses moved up the hierarchy. A difference in learning objective satisfaction was with knowledge (foundations, 72%; curriculum, 65%; administration, 63%).

In adult education, satisfaction with the learning objectives was inconsistent: Knowledge (55%) was rated higher in satisfaction than comprehension (51%). The learning objectives were rated lower in satisfaction overall for the pilot project when compared to the established subject areas.

Satisfaction with the emotional support aspects of school were similar for the established subject areas and differed for the pilot project (foundations, 89%; curriculum, 87%; administration, 81%, adult education, 72%).

### Student Life Satisfaction

The beliefs about the environment of the program to support students was similar for the established subjects and differed for the pilot project. Between groups in the established subjects, satisfaction with the positive supports experienced was similar (foundations 77%, curriculum 76%, and administration 76%). Satisfaction with the positive experiences gained was different for adult education (64%) when compared to the established programs. The absence of negative experiences was similar for established subject areas (foundations, 81%; curriculum, 81%; administration, 78%); adult education (71%) again differed when compared to the established areas.

In the four domains of school, satisfaction with the emotional and social support experiences across subject areas decreased. Between the established subjects, satisfaction was similar for each of the domains of school. Comparison between adult education and administration showed a difference in the satisfaction expressed about the freedom given students to interact with others (administration, 68%; adult education, 61%). The remaining three school domains in adult education were similar in

satisfaction to administration.

#### Study Location Satisfaction

Respondents attended four locations of study. The established locations were Park Royal, Dundas/McMaster (Dundas) and Brock; Seneca/Sheridan (Seneca) was new. Opinions of satisfaction reported for these four geographic locations had a population mix from previous variables.

Table 11 shows the background aspects of respondents attending each campus. In the established campuses (Park Royal, Dundas, Brock) the percent of females at each location varied from Park Royal with 82% to Brock with 71%. The largest percentage of full-time students were at Brock. In subject areas, the percent of students in the established campuses were composed primarily of students from the established subjects areas. The population attending Seneca was dominated by adult education students (60%). The number of courses completed by the majority of students were six or more for the established locations, and five or less for Seneca. The kilometers travelled to classes varied between locations; 13% of Park Royal respondents travelled more than 100, while 51% of Brock less than 26.

Table 11. Background Aspects of Respondents By Study Location.

		Park Royal	Dundas	Brock	Seneca
Item	n =	135	90	119	25
Gender Distribution					
Females		82%	77%	71%	80%
Males		18%	23%	29%	20%
Enrollment Status					
Full Time		2%	4%	10%	0%
Part Time		98%	96%	90%	100%
Subject Area					
Foundations		22%	33%	32%	16%
Curriculum		43%	36%	38%	12%
Administration		33%	30%	28%	12%
Adult Education		2%	1%	2%	60%
Courses Completed by Respondents					
1-5		41%	41%	36%	48%
6-10		46%	51%	48%	40%
Not Reported		13%	8%	16%	12%
Return Travelling Distance					
1-25 km.		34%	34%	51%	44%
25-100 km.		37%	29%	35%	36%
Over 100 km.		13%	8%	7%	8%
Not Reported		16%	29%	7%	12%

Table 12 shows the similarities and differences in satisfaction with the quality of school life for the four study locations. Across the study locations, as overall satisfaction decreased, the reported satisfaction with learning and student life also decreased. In the established locations of study, similar overall, learning and student life satisfaction opinions were reported by students. Comparing the established study location of Brock to Seneca, showed a difference in overall and learning but not student life satisfaction. Comparison of Seneca to Park Royal and Dundas showed a difference in satisfaction for overall, learning and student life.

#### Learning Satisfaction

In the established locations, satisfaction with learning objective increased the higher objectives were in the learning hierarchy. Satisfaction with the objectives of learning were similar across the established study locations. In comparison, at Seneca learning objective satisfaction increased inconsistently as responses moved up the hierarchy; knowledge (63%) was rated higher than comprehension (59%). One learning objective of similar satisfaction between Seneca, Park Royal and Dundas was for

Table 12. Opinions of Satisfaction by Study Location.

Item	n =	Park Royal, % Dundas, % Brock, % Seneca, %			
		135	90	119	25
Overall		91	89	84	72
Learning		82	83	81	72
Knowledge		61	67	70	63
Comprehension		73	75	74	59
Application		77	76	78	60
Analysis		78	77	81	71
Synthesis		83	83	83	75
Evaluation		87	86	84	79
Value Complex		86	89	83	76
Student Life		81	81	78	72
Satisfaction		80	79	70	67
Not Dissatisfied		81	78	79	74
Status		71	74	70	63
Identity		82	81	81	76
Teachers		87	87	85	73
Opportunity		87	88	89	83

evaluation.

The emotional support aspects of school were similar across the established locations (Park Royal, 86%; Dundas, 89%; Brock, 83%). Seneca (76%) results, when compared to Brock, were similar but when compared to Park Royal and Dundas differed.

Student Life Satisfaction

Satisfaction with the beliefs students held about the environmental support of the program by location varied. Across locations, the positive support of the environment was similar between Park Royal (80%) and Dundas (79%); results were similar for Brock (70%) and Seneca (67%). Comparison of results between locations of study varied in similarity or difference depending upon the relationship being examined.

Satisfaction with the absence of negative experiences received were similar across established locations of study (Park Royal, 81%; Dundas, 78%; Brock, 79%). Seneca (74%) findings, when compared to Dundas and Brock were similar but different when compared to Park Royal.

In the four domains of school, satisfaction with the emotional and social support experienced varied. The freedom given students by the school to interact



with others (status) was similar in the established locations (Park Royal, 71%; Dundas, 74%; Brock, 70%) and differed between established locations and the new location of Seneca (63%). Across the locations of study, students expressed similar opinions of satisfaction with the support given independent learning (identity) and the opportunity offered by the curriculum. A difference in opinion occurred between Seneca and the established for the domain of teachers. Across the domains, students in the established locations favored learning acquisition, while at Seneca students favored independent learning acquisition (identity and opportunity).

In review, the results of this survey suggested there was a diversity of student opinions about the quality of life experienced. It was not possible in survey findings to ascertain what prompted or supported student opinions of satisfaction. To address this issue, qualitative findings are presented. The results of the interviews and review of voluntary questionnaire comments offer limited insight into what was satisfying, less satisfying or of concern to students about the quality of life in the Brock Master of Education program.

### Reflections of Brock Master Students

The perceptions of 154 survey respondents are represented in this section of data; the breakdown being five interviews and 149 individuals who provided voluntary comments. The opinions offered here represent 20% of the total Master of Education population registered in the winter term of 1991 and 42% of the total survey population. The themes identified from interviews are reported as comments from interviewees while themes or supportive data from questionnaire voluntary comments are identified as comments from students.

### Background

The survey itself was perceived as an opportunity to reflect upon life in the Master of Education program. Students wrote, "Enjoyed doing the questionnaire because it allowed me to reflect" and "it is nice to have an opportunity to reflect and share my views on the M.Ed. program." Students reported opinions about the quality of life experienced in the program were reached by "averaging out of experiences." Specifically, students reported comparing one experience to another followed by reaching a general opinion. As one

student wrote, "Obviously, some of the courses are much more interesting than others; therefore, when completing the questionnaire the responses seem to average out."

Some students suggested having difficulty generalizing opinions about the quality of life in the program. Three reasons students identified as promoting difficulty with generalizing responses focused on the number of courses taken, perceptions of no new knowledge being gained, and the distance driven to reach classes. First, when a small number of courses had been taken, especially one or two, students wrote: "It was difficult to answer the first part of the survey as I have only been exposed to one course" and "some of the questions were difficult to evaluate as I have had only one course." One student returned the instrument unanswered with an appended message that read: "As I have just completed my second course, I do not feel your survey can be answered with any degree of conviction, sorry."

Second, when students perceived they already had the knowledge being asked about before entering the program some wrote: "I am not sure the M.Ed. program taught me those things listed in Part One" and "I

already had those skills you asked about before entering the program."

Third, when referring to distance students commented: "Some of your questions were difficult for me to answer because of the distance I live from Brock. The quality [of life] for me is very different ... I find it very arduous to manage pre-session and after-class reunions" and "Having time to socialize with other students is hard when driving a long way to get to class."

#### Overall Satisfaction

What was satisfying for four of the interviewees and from 67 student comments was that the program was part time, it offered an opportunity for students to select courses between subject areas, and fit itself to student needs. As a student commented, "The program is personalized with .... emphasis on designing assignments to fit personal interests".

The congruence between student and program was described by interviewee "C" as, "The program provided me with the opportunity to enhance both my learning and personal qualities by letting me fit the program to my needs." From an organizational perspective, the program was described as, "Client-centered" and

"fitting itself to student needs."

Less positive opinions of satisfaction with the program were expressed by some students as the program not meeting expectations and aspirations when compared to experiences in other programs. As a student stated: "I had the opportunity to take an M.Ed. course from another institution ... it was more stimulating and challenging ... and has deepened my dissatisfaction with the program."

Less satisfaction was also expressed with the support given to part-time students. Lack of support was expressed as a lack of guidance for part-time students: "[part-time] are on their own to decide courses, projects and or thesis;" "Who can part-time call to get help?"; and "The librarians in the Instructional Resource Center are my best source of information." Support was also expressed as a need for professors to consider part-time student time constraints as full-time workers: "Instructors should lighten the work load ... we [part-time] are full-time workers" and "It is good that professors recognize we work all day before coming to class."

Issues of concern expressed by students about the program focused on the public's opinion. Public

perceptions of the quality and standards of the program were reported as: "I am frustrated with my colleagues [at work] ... most think [the program] is very slack and a gift ... I often have to defend it" and "When I talk to people at work they think everyone gets an 'A' in the program without really working hard ... I worked hard for mine." Part of the difficulty with how the program presented itself was attributed to a poor marketing strategy. Several students commented: "The program needs to market itself better."

The concern most often noted by students was a perceived lack of information available about the program, especially knowledge about what was expected from students. The focus of this concern was the quality of the information being given to potential candidates and current students about organizational goals and processes. As students commented, "The program did not meet my expectations ... I am not sure it represents itself well in its description to students"; "All of the onus seems to be on the student to communicate, the university seems just interested in making sure they get their money" and "in general quite satisfied with the course offerings

and teaching staff ... written communication and fee notices have been very inaccurate ... this has colored my attitude ... my desired now is to get my degree finished and get out of Brock." The extent of communication difficulties between the program and students were evident in two basic questions left unanswered by students: (a) "What are the standards of the program?"; and (b) "What is the basis of the standard behind learning in the program?"

#### Learning Satisfaction

The words used most often to describe learning in the program were, "interesting" and "useful"; seldom used were the words "excellence" or "challenging." What was "great" about the learning experience was being, "treated as an adult and not a child." This sentiment expressed the views of the five interviewees and 53 student comments. What was "positive" about learning was that it was "cooperative", used the "adult learning model" and permitted students to be "self-directed." As one student commented, "The strength of the program is [its] self-directed learning approach".

Self-directed learning was described as a way students were able to have input into learning as well

as personal control and influence over course work.

Interviewee "A" described self-directed learning as what graduate study meant:

To have input into the direction one's studies will take ... the way of preparing and carrying out presentations ... how I should/would proceed with assignments ... the type and depth of assignments ... how it is to be graded ... to meet your own standards of satisfaction.

However, there were statements indicating some students expected professors to provide the knowledge to be learned. As example: "I do not feel I have learned anything from my professors"; "The courses have not taught me a great deal"; "Courses only gave me a base"; and "Professors should have to teach a certain amount of the time ... and not give so much class time to student presentations."

The perceived standards of learning for students focused on different expectations of learning, practical knowledge or knowledge mastery. For students seeking practical knowledge comments were positive; for students seeking knowledge mastery comments were less positive.

Of the 25 students who commented on the practical aspect of the program only two students described it as "a balance of theory with practice" and "it is professionally and academically oriented." Most



students spoke of the benefits gained from practical learning in terms of work: "I can use much of what I have learned at work"; "I have been able to apply the majority of material covered in courses to my work" and as interviewee "E" commented: "The program gave me a lot of confidence in terms of how I feel about my teaching and my skill as a teacher."

However, for students expecting knowledge mastery sentiments about learning in the program differed. As one student commented:

I expected the Master program to focus on a specific area ... but, if one were to look at what was learned in terms of what a student should be learning in a Masters level program, then the learning might not be what it should be.

Students expecting knowledge mastery viewed a Master program as: "A graduate degree should be primarily theoretically based rather than practical training" and "I expected to learn more theory ... but ... there were no courses on theory." From this perspective, courses in the program were described as "generally intellectually lightweight" and "the simplest ever taken." These statements were referenced to previous experiences in other Master programs or Master of Education programs. More detailed examples are: "There is no comparison

between the rigor of my previous Master program and the unfocused anecdotal level of the writing and discussion in most of the Brock courses I have taken" and "I took an M.Ed. course from another institution ... it was far more demanding and stimulating."

A concern expressed about learning in general focused on a perceived lack of consistency in the quality of learning. Students commented: "Some courses are excellent and others are not"; "The caliber of much of the [course] work varies from average and to excellent"; "Students give presentations without thesis statements"; "Courses should be challenging ... this does not always happen"; and "The lack of standards of the program in terms of work excellence to grades has me concerned."

Another concern reported by 23 students was a perceived bias of the program toward elementary education and/or formal institutions. It was expressed that class discussions did not always consider those outside of these two areas. As example: "The M.Ed. program provides more courses and information about primary and junior education than secondary"; "Discussions are too board-related ... there are others not in boards"; and "Shift the focus

away from all M.Ed. students are teachers, those of us from other professions have educational expertise."

### Student Life Satisfaction

The program was described by students as: "A place where people are more important than politics." In student life what was reported as a positive feature that attracted students was; "The people ... especially the professors." Overall perceptions of less positive aspects of student life in the program focused on the large number of part-time students and the satellite campuses.

What was directly linked to student satisfaction, from the five interviewees and 55 student comments, were professors. They were the focal point of learning as well as the link between the organization and student, especially for part-time students. What was important about professors was how they interacted with students. As one student expressed: "Professors ... make me feel special. I don't get that anywhere else." Satisfaction was supported by professors who were "friendly", "open to discussion and new ideas", "expressed interest in the students' learning achievements" and who were "fair."

Professors were assigned several roles by students. First, there were depicted as the initial supporter of student success in the program. This role was described as: "The bridge over the gap between pre-course uncertainty and second course certainty." As interviewee "E" reported: "The professor of our first class was very supportive ... made us feel we were worthwhile, that we could do the program, that everyone would succeed."

Second, professors were described as sources of opportunities for students to interact and build peer relationships during class time. Professors who factored time for students to interact during class were characterized as: "Recognizing the needs of adult learners to learn from each other." One student wrote: "My satisfaction with the program stems from professors who recognize that graduate students can learn from each other, that we need to interact as well as receive input from them."

When professors did not meet these needs, student comments asked for professors to place "more emphasis on cooperative learning", "more self-direction needed" and "professors should place more emphasis on cooperative learning." The importance of these

requests centered on needing opportunities to network with other graduate students. As one student stated: "The best time for me to meet with other students who share the same interests are during classes."

A third description of professors was as advisors. This role had two sides, exit paper or course advisors. As exit paper advisors, professors were described by 48 students as excellent. The difficulty for most students was a communication issue. Students were unsure of who and how to contact professors to assume the role. For one student, approaching a professor to be an exit paper advisor was described as, "feeling self-conscious asking someone to be my advisor ... I am not sure of the whole process."

Students approaching professors as course advisors reported experiences as either excellent or being put off. Seventeen comments focused on this role, with 14 relating less than positive descriptions. As interviewee "B" commented: "I wanted a better idea on when to do certain courses ... the response was 'ah don't worry' ... I was worried". Yet, interviewee "A" told of a more positive experience; "Early in my entry, my faculty advisor gave me some wise suggestions on a number of issues about courses ... he

told me any time you see me just come on in and talk."

A specific focus of less satisfaction for some students occurred when professors were not helpful, were distracted and open to opinions only if they matched their own. As students commented: "Dissatisfaction with the program stems from professors"; "the biggest problem is unhelpful professors"; and "professors do not always seem to be interested in helping students."

One concern of some students was in securing an advisor. As one student commented: "I feel rudderless and do not know whom to call ... the result is that my enthusiasm is waning", while another stated, "getting an advisor, this is a real problem for me, I am on course seven and still do not have one."

A second concern was with gaining the correct information when students wanted it. The concern focused on the timeliness, availability, and accuracy of information. Students commented: "The accuracy of information is not always there, or there when you want it"; "I was told I could do the program in eight months as a full-time student, now that is not true"; and "I went looking for advice in August before

classes began and could not find anyone." A suggestion offered by one student as a possible answer to both roles was "more structure needs to be made of the concept of advisor, at present this is more of an ad hoc aspect."

### Enrollment Status

The satisfaction of students with the quality of life experienced seemed to have its roots in time and the lack of it. There was a distinct difference in full-time and part-time student perception of the quality of learning achievable and student life that could be experienced. The sentiments of 31 part-time students was stated well by one as: "If I had taken a leave from teaching and done my M.Ed. full time I may have gotten more out of the program."

### Part Time

The main focus of commentary from the majority of part-time students was on the influence of time. The sense of what part-time study meant to students was being a transient visitor to the program; a visitor who stood at a distance from the program and graduate student life due to time.

Learning satisfaction. One of the most often reported difficulties for students was having the time

to give the attention they would like to class work. The greatest difficulty for students was coping with work. Coping was described as an experience of "coping with course work and other commitments ... not necessarily in this order," of fitting "the work in when and where I can," and as "being able to fit my course work in my work (situation) ... this helps me get my [course] work accomplished."

What students fit the time spent on course work into was both busy work and personal lives. Life for part-time students was depicted as the "balancing [of] life commitments to program commitments." One student commented; "With career, federation, family, and church commitments, Brock course hours seem like a necessary evil for a time." For those students who did have the time to give to their program work it was because of fewer commitments to their time. As example: "I do not have extended commitments beyond the course"; "I am on sabbatical from work so I can give more time to the program" or "I have no child care commitments so have time for course work."

Several students noted that a side effect of "coping with work" was that learning in the course could be negatively affected when professors opted to



decrease course work to meet part-time student needs for less work. One student commented:

My biggest complaint is ... students who seem to always complain about the amount of work .... Some faculty members pamper to them .... in order for me to feel proud of my accomplishment and proud of my degree I want to know I was inspired to work hard and achieve excellence.

For some part-time students, the most enjoyable time to learn was during the summer, while for others it was not possible to take summer courses. A student commented, "I do not get the summer off, I am not a teacher." For those who commented on summer courses they were seen as an opportunity to focus on learning which was described as "more fun." One student suggested, "the best time to be a part-time student is during summer sessions when there is time to concentrate on class work." A student who worked during the summer suggested the program, "have summer evening courses so [those students who] work can attend."

Student life satisfaction. Student life was discussed by 25 part-time students as a time to interact with other students. Socialization with other students was reported as a limited experience for most part-time students. Much of the limitation was related to available time; some of the limitation

was intentional. For some students developing a graduate student life was not a goal. As one respondent noted: "I have enough trouble dealing with all of the other social aspects of my life ... the social aspect my graduate student life is the last on the priority list." It was suggested the best time to socialize as a part-time student was in the summer when there was time to network with others.

The importance of classes as socialization opportunities was reported by interviewee "D" as: "I found I had time only to socialize with people in my classes ... family commitments did not give me time and being a distance from the university, I tended not to get there unless I had class." Part-time students suggested the program was providing them with an opportunity "to know other graduate students" and "to network with them through classes." Five students offered the sentiment that "full-time students surely have a richer life."

#### Full Time

This small group offered limited discussion about themselves. Respondents discussed learning and student life in terms of time but referenced it to the opportunity to grow. Learning was described as

"having time to grow" and "having time to reflect and focus on my subject." Life experiences were depicted as "having time to build relationships with a group who have similar interests" and "having time to work with professors in research or as teaching assistance."

A communication difficulty students experienced as part-time and to some extent full-time was the lack of guidance offered to students. Students suggested that "a support system is needed" that was not reliant upon professors. The need for a support system was expressed in terms of information accessibility, timeliness, consistency and accuracy. What several students reported they needed was "more initial direction as to how to tackle the program" and "to know which courses to take when." It was asked by one student: "If there is a counselor for graduate students, who is it a and where are they located?"

#### Subject Area

Satisfaction with learning in subject areas was commented on by the five interviewees and in 63 student comments. A trend in comments for the established programs was that the closer course work fit to a student's job the more positive the comments;

where course work was described as not always having a direct application to jobs comments were less positive. The adult education group provided an explanation of its approach to learning.

A general concern of students was how course work was evaluated when learning was self-directed. What was perceived as fitting with the self-directed learning style was for students to provide direct inputs into the evaluation of their work. The value of this approach was described as supporting personal growth in the learner. As interviewee "A" suggested: "It is very important to have input into grades because you then become a conscious evaluator of your own work and effort." The concern about course evaluation with independent learning was with how professors graded different types of work. As interviewee "C" commented: "I do not know how professors graded all of the different things students presented during seminars ... in the end everyone got the same mark." Independent learning grading by professors alone evoked words such as "confronting" and "laissez-faire." Examples of student concerns about grades were: "Are grades measured on academic achievement?"; "I worry grades are a measure of

niceness" and "I write researched papers and get frustrated when someone who has regurgitated an author ... gets the same grade as I." One suggestion made by interviewee "B" was to use a "pass or fail grading system ... the majority would pass or we would not be accepted."

### Foundations

Limited comments were offered by students in this subject area. Satisfaction with learning was described as "enlightening", "informative", "enjoyable", and "the best ever taken."

### Curriculum

Voluntary commentary provides a picture of a practical based knowledge stream. Courses were reported to be "excellent professional development." Other words describing courses were "useful" and "applicable to work." Issues raised about courses focused on a perceived lack of evaluation standards and the absence of self-directed learning in some courses. As example, students commented: "A lack of standards in work excellence to grades awarded, especially in presentations" and a request for "more self-directed learning in some courses" were made.

### Administration

Comments were divided in this stream about the quality of learning experienced. Courses were characterized by one student as: "Some courses are excellent and others that I really got little out of." What students focused on in describing courses was the basis of the course, theory or practical. For the courses that meshed both together well students expressed favorable comments such as, "I have recommended this program because of [professor Y's] course, the best ever taken"; and for students who were looking for practical knowledge; "There were some great learning opportunities, especially the practical courses."

Negative comments about courses focused on the absence of self-directed learning, course evaluation (grading of students), course availability, course content, course materials and feedback from professors about course work. Students commented: "There needs to be a reality check as many of the concepts learned cannot be applied"; "Too often readings are assigned and never referred to again"; and "The course work does not really prepare one for the exit paper, it is too easy to avoid the library." Feedback to students

was an issue described as: "It seems a lot of time lapses before I receive assignments back."

Communication difficulties identified about this subject area were that "it was not marketed properly" and "some professors do not seem to know what they want ... which contributes to a sense of a lack of coordination and direction for courses."

### Adult Education

There was limited discussion offered about learning and student life in this subject area. The comments offered by six students and one interviewee were mixed in satisfaction. Learning was described by one student as:

Learning is down to earth ... with a lot of theory, but with a practical aspect when discussing theory ... we teach ourselves it seems, but we are in an adult education program learning adult learning principles to help us teach other adult learners

Another student described learning as: "I do not feel I have learned anything from instructors, hopefully this can be attributed to a new program going through growing pains."

To put these comments into context, the uniqueness of this group in the Master of Education program must be described. What was distinctive in this subject area was its population and location. Adult education

was a new pilot project for community college educators with classes held primarily at the Seneca campus. Interviewee "E" described student motivation to enter the program and experience in the Master of education program as:

[It] was not part of our job requirement and had nothing to do with money ... the experience was very positive ... we had good feedback and a good relationship with the university and its staff ... they applied the principles of adult education and put their money where their mouth was.

What was unique about adult education was the group dynamics that were described by students. It was reported that the use of group dynamics was initiated by the university "to support [our] sense of being able to succeed." However, reports from students suggest the support between group members grew to the extent that students identified themselves in commentary as "we" and "our group."

The strength of group identity was such that it was reported: "We had regular meeting to discuss issues and concerns." Another result of the identity developed between students was the sense of responsibility shared by members about the success of other members. The responsibility for group members was referenced to the learning achieved by each group member. As interviewee "E" commented: "We did



presentations ... we recognized the need to do quality work ... our peers needed good information ... we were all just workaholics or perfections to reach this goal."

### Study Location

Commentary about study locations was limited and focused on the influence of satellite campuses on learning and student life. Three areas of discussion emerged from interviews and comments: (a) class size and course availability; (b) satellites and convenience courses; and (c) distance and identity.

### Class Size and Course Availability

One part of the concern about course availability focused on class size and student demand. Interviewee "D" told of three separate but identical experiences with courses completed by the time of the interview: "Every single course began with the professor saying on the first day 'don't know if this course is going to run' ... some courses if I had dropped out of would have folded." A factor several students suggested may have contributed to the low course enrollment was summed up by one student as: "everybody waiting until the first week of classes, going to a class to see if they like it, and then registering by Friday ...

avoiding the financial penalty for dropping and changing a course." One student reported registering late as a function of "not being sure of what courses [were] really wanted, especially when first starting."

#### Satellite Campuses and Convenience Courses

The greatest amount of commentary focused on this topic. The effect of satellite campuses was on the courses available to students. Interviewee "D" described Brock learning as, "anyone doing their program through Brock University has to be committed to travel and/or go out once or twice a week in the evenings or they will not be able to get the courses they want."

Multiple campus locations for courses solicited positive comments from students who were willing or able to travel. Students suggested the benefit of satellite campuses were: "It has been an added bonus to be able to go between Dundas, McMaster and Park Royal for courses"; "An added bonus of being at Brock is different course locations"; and "The only way I could attend courses is with a location close to me."

The cost of satellite campuses were for those students unwilling or unable to travel. The effect on students was in courses which were labeled "courses of

convenience". This effect was described by students as: "Many of us are being made to take courses out of location convenience"; "I am taking courses because of their location"; and "I have taken courses not out of interest but because of geographic location." The suggested end result for students was described by interviewee "C", who had also taken courses out of convenience, as: "The loss of opportunity to the learner."

#### Distance and Identity

Distance was depicted as limiting to socialization opportunities with other students. Student comments described distance as "one of the most difficult aspects of the course"; and "A big disadvantage in doing the Masters at Brock." One respondent described the student life experience in the program as: "I arrive, sit in a class and leave ... there is no time to network with other students."

Distance was also described as contributing to a loss of student identity with the program itself. Students identified themselves in relation to the campus most often attended. One student suggested, "If a student is primarily involved with off-campus courses there is less of a sense of actually belonging

to the Faculty." The extent of this perception for one student was reflected in the unanswered questionnaire returned to the researcher. The comment written across the instrument was: "This questionnaire does not apply to me. I am not in the Faculty of Education, I take my courses at Dundas."

### Other Unlisted Categories

#### Young Students

A unique issue about the program focused on the absence of graduate students under the age of 30 years. Interviewee "D" commented, "I expected to see young people ... but if you did a profile of who was in the program it would be sort of middle-aged ladies ... who do you know who is under 30?"

Five students commented on life as a young graduate student. It was a life of feeling displaced in the program and of not fitting into class discussions due primarily to a lack of work experience that could be shared. Young students suggested: "I feel I have nothing worthwhile to contribute"; "I feel I do not belong in the program"; and "Maybe I should have gone to OISE." The question interviewee "D" asked was: "Who is the program attracting? ... Why are they [older students] coming?" ... "Who does the

program need for the future?"

### Exit Paper

The exit paper (project or thesis) was also important. Twenty-seven students commented about the exit paper focusing on how courses prepared them for the task. Students described this final work as "the leap from course work ... to the project or thesis ... (it was) astronomical"; feeling "unprepared to deal with the number of drafts"; and being "frustrated with the demand of the APA style."

Alternative suggestions were offered to replace the project or thesis. First, replace the exit paper with two other courses; the reasoning was "to not limit course opportunities." Second, to present an exam to students; the reasoning being to help those with "time constraints." Third, give more credit weight to the project or thesis; the reasoning being, "the amount of work and time spent ... is worth more."

A concern expressed about doing either the project or thesis focused on the amount of guidance given to students before and after the work began. What was uncertain for some students was the program's expectations of the work. It was suggested by eight students that the program could better support them in

preparing for the paper by having "increased access to advisors" and helping students to build their courses toward "the end product." One means suggested by several students was to give to students or advise them to purchase at the time of their first course the publication Putting the Pieces Together.

#### Education Programs

Comparison of the three education programs (Brock Master of Education, Brock Pre-Service Teacher Education and Manitoba Master of Education) offered an opportunity to compare university programs beyond the first undergraduate degree. The Brock Pre-Service Teachers Education program survey was a retrospective assessment. The Manitoba Master of Education program was a voluntary mail-back survey.

Table 13 presents the population characteristics of the three programs. The respondent size between each program differed; Brock Master (370), Manitoba Master (229), and Brock Pre-Service (158). The Master programs showed similar findings for respondents' ages and motivation. Brock Pre-Service were younger and reported a lower high motivation rating. Females predominated across the three programs. English predominated student backgrounds across the three

Table 13. Population Characteristics of Education Programs.

Item	Brock Pre-Service	Brock Master	Manitoba Master
Respondents	158	370	229
Age (years)	27	38	36
Gender			
Female	81%	77%	73%
Male	19%	23%	27%
Background			
English	53%	69%	51%
French	7%	4%	4%
Other	40%	28%	45%
Motivation			
High	83%	88%	85%
Moderate	7%	4%	9%
Low	9%	8%	7%

programs. Each of Brock Pre-Service and Manitoba Master programs reported higher Other category backgrounds than Brock Master students.

Table 14 presents the comparable findings of the three programs. Across the three programs as overall satisfaction decreased, reported learning and student life satisfaction also decreased. Between programs, the Brock Master program was rated higher in overall and learning satisfaction than either of the Brock Pre-Service Teacher Education or Manitoba Master programs. Student life satisfaction was similar for both Brock programs (Pre-Service, 77; Master, 79) and different when Master programs were compared (Brock, 79; Manitoba, 65%).

#### Learning Satisfaction

Satisfaction with the objectives of learning was different between the Brock Master program and each of Brock Pre-Service and Manitoba Master programs. In the objectives of learning, a similar rating of satisfaction was given to the objective of knowledge by both Brock programs (Pre-Service, 61%; Master, 66%). Overall, satisfaction with the objectives of learning were rated higher by respondents in the Brock Master program; the higher the objectives were in the



Table 14. Opinions of Satisfaction by Education Program.

Item	N =	Brock Pre-Service, %	Brock Master, %	Manitoba Master, %
		158	370	229
Overall		76	87	52
Learning		68	81	60
Knowledge		61	66	50
Comprehension		65	73	53
Application		65	76	58
Analysis		64	78	52
Synthesis		71	82	62
Evaluation		69	85	60
Value Complex		71	85	65
Student Life		77	79	65
Satisfied		76	76	61
Not Dissatisfied		75	79	63
Status		75	71	55
Identity		78	81	72
Teachers		79	85	72
Opportunity		78	87	75

learning hierarchy, the higher the satisfaction. Both the Brock Pre-Service and Manitoba Master programs reported inconsistent satisfaction with learning objectives.

Opinions of the emotional support aspects differed between the three programs; Brock Pre-Service (71%), Brock Master (85%), Manitoba Master (65%).

#### Student Life Satisfaction

The beliefs students held about the support of the environment of their programs were similar for the Brock programs (Pre-Service, 77%; Master, 79%), but were different for Master programs (Manitoba, 65%; Brock, 79%). Satisfaction with the positive emotions experienced were the same the Brock programs (Pre-Service, 76%; Master, 76%) and different between Master programs (Brock, 76%; Manitoba, 61%). The absence of negative emotions experienced in the environment of programs was similar for Brock (Pre-Service, 75%; Master, 79%) and different for Master programs (Brock, 79%; Manitoba, 63%).

In the four school domains, satisfaction with the emotional and social support experiences in programs varied. The freedom given to students by the school (status) was similar for status, identity and teachers

between Brock programs. A difference in satisfaction between Brock programs was expressed about the relevancy of the curriculum to support students (Pre-Service, 78%; Master, 87%). Comparison of Master programs showed a difference across the four school domains, Brock students expressing higher levels of satisfaction across all domains.

#### Supplementary Findings

Table 15 shows the support in this research for the relationship between cognitive and affective opinions in two directions. First, examining data as either learning or student life satisfaction, the more positive affective opinions were, the greater the likelihood cognitive opinions were also more positive. Second, in each of the 15 data sets across both learning and student life the more positive affective learning opinions, the greater the likelihood cognitive student life opinions were also more positive.

#### Summary

What the predominantly female educators and part-time students in the Brock Master of Education program focused on when expressing opinions about the

Table 15. Patterns of Cognitive (C) and Affective (A) Opinions.

Item	Learning		Student Life	
	C, %	A, %	A, %	C, %
Brock Master Program				
Gender				
Female	78	87	79	82
Male	71	77	73	77
Enrollment Status				
Part Time	76	84	78	81
Full Time	84	95	74	90
Subject Area				
Foundations	79	89	79	84
Curriculum	78	87	79	82
Administration	75	81	77	79
Adult Education	64	72	68	74
Study Location				
Park Royal	77	86	81	82
Dundas/McMaster	77	89	79	83
Brock	78	83	75	82
Seneca/Sheridan	68	76	71	74
Education Programs				
Brock Master	77	85	78	81
Brock Pre-Service	66	71	76	78
Manitoba Master	56	65	62	69

Note: Data summarized from Tables 4, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 14.

quality of school life was learning acquisition. This was seen in the favoring of the learning domains of school and in the reflections of students. Students suggested motivation in the program was influenced by how professors presented themselves and the courses.

Survey findings showed differences and similarities between gender, enrollment status, subject areas, and locations of study. The objective of learning that was most often least favored was comprehension. In the domains of school, students favored learning acquisition (teachers and *identity*) except for students of Seneca who favored independent learning acquisition (identity and opportunity), which encompasses both social and learning dimensions. The variable results suggest females expressed higher satisfaction with overall and learning satisfaction, the emotional support aspects of school and the relevancy of the curriculum to meet student needs, than did males. In subject and location areas the time in the program differed between the established and new areas.

Across the variables of the Brock Master of Education program, the findings suggested a greater

likelihood when: (a) satisfaction with the emotional satisfaction of learning was higher, that the freedom given to students by the school to interact with others would also be higher; and (b) overall satisfaction decreased, that learning and student life satisfaction would also decrease.

The reflections of students suggested satisfaction was evaluated from the perspective of academic quality, professor support, learning approach used, the environment, time and communication. Three overall themes were identified as important to students about the program; it permitted part-time study, supported diverse learning opportunities, and fit itself to student needs. The chief concern of students was with the quality of the information available about the program, both before and after admission.

Learning was satisfying when students were treated as adults, when self-directed learning was used, and when cooperative learning occurred. The learning achieved was satisfying when it was practical. Less satisfaction was expressed about learning when it was not what the student had hoped to focus on, teachers did not use adult learning principals and/or did not

teach enough classes but used students to do the job. The emotional support for learning for students was linked to their relationships with professors. The overall concerns of students about learning was a perceived inconsistency in the quality of courses, course availability, and time to cope with work.

Student life satisfaction was linked to people being more important than politics. Professors were a major source of satisfaction and less satisfaction. What was satisfying about professors was how they interacted with students and how their roles supported students. The roles assigned professors were: (a) supporter of student success; (b) source of student interaction opportunities; and (c) advisors, exit paper and course. When professors did not meet each of these roles less satisfaction was reported, especially if related to class operations and course advisors. The overall concern in student life focused on information and communication.

Students had questions that require decision-maker consideration: (a) What are the standards of the program? (b) What are the standards behind learning in the program? (c) Is there a counselor for graduate students? (d) How do professors grade the different

types of work presented by independent learners and  
(e) Who does the program wish to attract in the  
future?

Comparison between education programs suggested  
Brock students (Master and Pre-Service) reflected  
similar more positive opinions about the emotional  
support offered by the school than did the respondents  
from Manitoba. Comparison of Master programs suggested  
satisfaction was distinctly different. Comparison of  
the three programs suggest students in programs beyond  
the first undergraduate degree have a greater  
likelihood of favoring the domains of learning  
acquisition (teachers and opportunity).

Finally, review of cognitive and affective  
opinions in the supplementary data suggested that the  
emotional support aspects of school were reflected in  
satisfaction with the domains of school.



## CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

### Summary

The quality of life in the Brock Master of Education program was satisfying to 87% of survey respondents. Student reflections supported survey findings and offered insights into why and how organizational processes and functions influenced satisfaction. Results suggested students assessed the quality of life in the program from the perspective of learning; students focused on the opportunity to gain knowledge. "Supportive of learning" at Brock was the philosophy of the school and the learning approach used, both which centered on student needs. Four factors described as influences on satisfaction were professors, self-directed learning, time and location.

Students in the Brock Master program expressed higher overall satisfaction with school life than Brock Pre-Service Teacher Education and Manitoba Master students. Supplementary data suggests students' satisfaction with learning focused on the limitations and freedoms of school; the emotional support aspect of learning was reflected in satisfaction with school domains.

### Discussion

Quality in this research is used in a normative way to indicate the sense of excellence gained from the program. School life focuses on the characteristic traits and attributes that were valuable and important to students. The motivation criteria students used to assess quality was balanced between intrinsic educative values and instrumental work-related values. Carr (1989) suggested it was important to know the motivation criteria as it influenced perceptions of excellence perceived about a situation.

The Brock Master program was predominated by part-time students who were female educators nearing forty. These characteristics are comparable to the Manitoba Master program in this research and to national statistics (Potts, 1989). For three-quarters of the students in both the Brock and Manitoba programs, study at the Master level was their final degree. This finding is consistent with research reported about Master programs in Canada (Britton, 1986).

### Overall Satisfaction

Literature reviewed in Chapter Two described overall satisfaction as a means of assessing separate

and different experiences of life to gain a sense of the good achieved. To the Brock Master students in this research, life quality focused on the opportunity to gain knowledge with support from student life. In the overall survey data, learning was rated higher than student life, which was reflected in student comments that focused on learning and how student life supported it through professors and their classes.

Overall trends that emerged from survey results are as follows. First, the lower overall satisfaction the greater the likelihood learning and student life satisfaction were also lower. Second, the lower the overall satisfaction became across groups in a variable, the greater the likelihood learning satisfaction was equal to or less than student life satisfaction. Third, the lower learning satisfaction, the greater the likelihood the emotional support aspect of the school was also lower; the higher the emotional support aspects of learning, the higher the satisfaction with the freedom given to students by the school to interact with others.

#### Learning Satisfaction

Learning satisfaction was defined in Chapter Three as representing the goals of an institution. School

literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggests the goal of a school is to have students assume responsibility for learning. The transfer of learning responsibility to the Brock students was reported in reflections as what the program did best through self-directed learning.

Learning was important to students as it provided the opportunity for them to meet current and future job opportunities. The evaluation of learning objectives suggests satisfaction with learning increases as responses move up the learning hierarchy. The learning objective that received repeated lower response rates was comprehension. What may influence the perception that comprehension is lower, in that satisfaction than the first objective of knowledge is rated higher. This was most notable in data sets of adult education, Seneca and full-time students.

Survey results suggest satisfaction with learning changed as the emotional support aspects of learning changed. Data from the study location of Dundas and from supplementary findings suggest the emotional support of learning changed as satisfaction with the domains of school changed. This trend reflects the pattern of cognitive and affective opinions reviewed

in Chapter Two. It also suggests the importance of school domains on student satisfaction which Batten and Girling-Butcher (1981) alluded to in their research.

Student reflections suggested what contributed to less favorable opinions of learning satisfaction was both professors and courses. Professors who were less supportive of learning did not invite class participation, had student presentations dominate class time, did not use adult learning principles, did not provide time for students to interact and were slow with feedback to students about course work. Courses were less satisfying to learning when selected out of convenience to a study location and time. These issues reflect similar comment in Master and school life research reviewed in Chapter Two.

What was perceived as the strength of learning in the Brock Master program was called adult learning, cooperative learning, or learning independence. Learning independence was also described as self-directed learning which was depicted as what graduate study meant to students -- to have control over the quality, quantity, and grading of work. This learning approach permitted students to fit the

program to meet their diverse needs as adult learners from many avenues of life. Master literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggested the importance of adult learning as a promoter of student satisfaction.

Self-directed learning was for some students a source of less satisfaction when professors graded work without student input, or when course learning was by student presentations that were not always rated as quality. There were few comments requesting traditional teaching approaches, most comments asked that teachers not use authoritative instruction. The question which arises from this difference is: How does the program support adult students who are not prepared to accept responsibility for learning? Students themselves asked for clarification of:

(a) What does self-directed learning mean in the program? and (b) What are the standards for self-directed learning?

How students assessed learning satisfaction was reported in reflections as a measure of the program meeting their aspirations and expectations. Satisfaction in the QOL literature presented in Chapter Two is described as the assessment of the gap between aspirations and expectations. Two distinct

aspirations were reported by students: Knowledge mastery and knowledge for practice. Students who entered the program to gain knowledge mastery made less positive comments about learning satisfaction and the program. Students who were seeking support for jobs and practical-based knowledge reported more positive comments about learning satisfaction and the program.

When the program's courses found a balance between theory and practice, student comments were positive. Students suggested what contributed to their expectations of the program not being met was not knowing what the focus of the program was or misinterpreting the description provided. In reviewing the program in the university calendar, the description of its purpose is to improve the professional competence of practitioners and provide a broad background in theory (Brock University Graduate Calendar, 1991-1992). First, what is meant by professional competence and broad-based background in theory? Second, why did students seeking learning mastery enter the program, when learning mastery was not indicated? Third, how many students would prefer a learning mastery program, and is the program willing

or able to meet the need? Fourth, what quality in learning is expected by the program to match its goal of academic quality?

What students neglected to comment on was their role in contributing to a less positive learning experience. Students who took courses of convenience described the role of the school but not their own role in opting for convenience courses. How many students actually took courses of convenience was not clear. What student reflections did suggest was that some students are attending classes at other institutions to gain courses of interest to them. The question is: How many, why, and what influence does this practice have on the program itself?

#### Student Life Satisfaction

In Chapter Three, student life was defined as the beliefs a student held about the support from the environment of school, themselves, and aspects of school. The support of the environment assessed the emotional likes and dislikes of students. Overall, survey results suggested the students were satisfied with the program environment.

Student reflections provide a unique insight into the perceived environment of the Brock program.



Students suggested that the program was friendly and a place where people were more important than politics. Considering the work history of students as educators in formal educational institutions, the context of this remark may reflect students considering the Brock environment in relation to their work environment. The question which emerges is: What is the influence of the work place on student satisfaction? This question seems especially important if the school place is also the work place.

Quality of life literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggests domains permit an evaluation of the difference between aspirations and expectations in a life situation.

#### Status

In the school domains across all Brock data sets and each of the two educational programs, students rated the freedom given to them to interact with others lowest of all the domain of school. An increase in the satisfaction expressed about status appeared to occur when the emotional support of learning (value complex) was also higher, when comparisons were made across groups of a variable. This was most notable in the data for Dundas and

matches students' comments requesting interaction opportunities during class time. Master literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggests the opportunity for students to interact with their peers is an essential component of satisfaction and socialization as a graduate student. What students did not indicate was what type of interaction opportunities they were looking for.

### Identity

The support the school gave to independent learning varied as overall and student life satisfaction changed. In survey results as overall and student life satisfaction decreased, comments in reflections about the support of independent learning also decreased. This trend was most notable in the established program of administration and was reflected in the increase in the number of negative comments students offered about this subject area.

The quality of life literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggested the more negative experiences in a situation, the less recollection of positive experiences. There were some positive comments about the excellence of professors and courses in the

administration subject area. Most student comments for this area were generalized and negative. The occurrence of strongly positive comments by some students raises questions of the generalization of comments to all courses and professors in the administration area. Also, students did not indicate the time they were referring to when making these comments; courses change, professors change, and satisfaction changes.

### Teachers

The support teachers gave to students and their learning was described as the point where the organization and the student met. Across Brock survey findings, teachers were rated higher in satisfaction than the support of independent learning, except for the new location of Seneca.

What student reflections suggested was satisfying about teachers was that they cared about the student. Caring was described as teachers being welcoming, bridging student uncertainty when first entering the program, offering good advice, recognizing the needs of full-time workers and being available. However, these same attributes of caring teachers were also what students saw as less satisfying when professors

did not seem to have time for students or care because students did not attend full time. Do all part-time students feel this way or is it a minority? Do part-time students at Brock want to have the same opportunities as full-time students to work with professors as research assistance? Some part-time student comments suggested their lives might have been better and may have been gained more from the program if they had attended as full-time students. Is it part-time students who are planning to move toward doctoral study who wish to have opportunities similar to full-time students?

#### Opportunity

The relevancy of the curriculum to meet student needs was the highest domain of satisfaction across data sets, except for males. Student curriculum needs focused on learning competency, getting involved, in work and knowing how to cope with it.

Coping with work in the Brock Master program seems to be related to the fact that students are part-time and have limited time to be reflective learners. How some part-time students reported coping with course work was by controlling it through self-directed learning and having professors reduce course work

loads. Is the work load too heavy? Is the program meeting its goal of academic quality by reducing work loads to meet student demands?

### Variable Satisfaction

Throughout this discussion, reference has been made to the variables of this research but no clear description was offered as to how satisfaction differed or was the same within each variable. Satisfaction differences seemed to be related to two reasons: gender and time.

#### Gender

A general assessment of background aspects of students suggested males linked motivation closer to courses than females. Males also reported having completed a higher number of courses than females, yet their opinions were less positive. This finding is in contradiction to previous school life quality research reviewed in Chapter Two that suggested the more time in a program, the higher the satisfaction reported.

The higher satisfaction of females than males reflects past findings of the quality of school life research presented in Chapter Two. What seems important to discuss is not that females are higher in

satisfaction with school life, but that males were less satisfied. For males, life in the program was less than desirable in meeting their expectations for learning. This is seen in the less positive opinion assigned to the support of the curriculum to meet their needs, the lower evaluation given to learning objectives, and less satisfaction with the emotional support aspects of the program. Contributing to the difference in female and male opinions may be the gap between perceived entitlement and need from a life situation. Vermunt et al. (1989) suggested that males evaluate a life situation in terms of what is entitled to, while females evaluate it in terms of what is needed.

Finally, in Chapter Two, it was suggested that individuals may convey a high opinion about positive aspects of life and simultaneously convey less favorable opinions. Females conveyed a high opinion of student life, yet a less favorable opinion of status. Males conveyed a less favorable opinion about student life, yet a higher opinion about teachers.

#### Enrollment Status

Satisfaction differed between part- and full-time students for overall and learning but were similar for

student life. Student reflections suggest time was important to perceptions of the quality of life. The chief difference between groups was the difference in what time meant in relation to learning.

Full-time student satisfaction suggest that these students achieved their learning goals and aspirations. The quality of life literature in Chapter Two suggests the smaller the gap between aspirations and expectations, the higher the satisfaction reported. In reflection, full-time study meant spending most time at one location, having time to be reflective learners, having time to socialize with peers and having time to work with professors to be socialized into the role of researchers. All of these attributes of full-time study were suggested in the Master literature reviewed in Chapter Two as elements that promoted satisfaction. Working in the place of school may explain why full-time students were less positive when assessing the absence of negative experiences in the environment than part time.

Part-time student satisfaction suggests there was a wider gap between what students aspired to and what was, the result being differences in overall and

learning satisfaction. The reflections of part-time students suggest life as a Master student is one of time management between course demands and life demands, unavailable time to socialize outside of the classroom, lost time travelling to and from campuses and time restrictions to complete the program.

Time also influences satisfaction from the perspective of the program. The quality of school life research reviewed in Chapter Two suggests the longer the time in school, the higher the satisfaction reported. Full-time students had a distinctly greater amount of time in courses than part-time. The satisfaction of full-time students may also be influenced by having both study and course time to contribute to their opinions of satisfaction; part-time students had less of both.

Overall, students suggested what was needed from the program was help in managing time. Help was discussed as having written material to refer to for commonly asked questions, a directory on who to call for information about specific administrative matters and help in planning courses to direct learning towards the final paper.



### Subject Area

In the background aspects of students, the high motivation rating of students decreased as satisfaction in the program decreased and as students linked motivation more to courses. This seems a reasonable trend as the learning which was important to students overall was tied to emotional support aspects that influenced motivation. The closer motivation was linked to courses and the less satisfied students were with those courses, the lower the motivation.

The different sample in the subject area is adult education. One difference for this group was that their school place was also their work place. Whether this contributed to less satisfaction is not known. The major difference between this subject area and others in the program was the group dynamics of students. However, it may have been that the group dynamics contributed to the opinions of satisfaction offered about this subject area. School life quality literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggests that when students turn to other students and not teachers for help with work, the perceived quality of school life satisfaction decreases.

From the limited comments by this group, the role of teachers seems to focus on supporting student success with becoming adult educators; by letting them practice the skills of being adult learners on themselves. One student commented that they had not learned from teachers. Possibly some students may not be prepared for the role. Another possibility is that less positive comments came from those students who were new to the program, especially as this area was heavily represented by students with less than five courses. The quality of school life research reviewed in Chapter Two suggests time is a limitation on satisfaction in school, while social indicators literature suggested time in a life situation influenced satisfaction due to situational familiarity. Both factors may have influenced student responses.

#### Location of Study

Background aspects of students show the mixture of reporting for campus locations. Gender and time were influences in the satisfaction ratings reported. Notable across the established locations of study is the similarities in satisfaction responses for both learning and student life. What is notably different

is the lower scores for the new study location of Seneca. Social indicators literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggests time is a limitation on satisfaction with the quality of life. In the study locations, student reflections discussed time in terms of distance travelled and its relationship to learning and student life.

Also of importance to note in the results was the difference in learning satisfaction of Dundas and the selection of independent learning acquisition by students of Seneca. First, the Dundas data show that when the emotional support aspects of learning was high, student satisfaction with the freedom given them by the school to interact with others was also high. This finding reflects the measurement of cognitive and affective beliefs and what Master literature in Chapter Two says is important to graduate student satisfaction. Yet, findings across the variables of this study suggest satisfaction with the freedom given students to interact with others is the least favored school domain. School life quality literature in Chapter Two suggests this is a function of increasing time in school. Is there a linkage between the emotional support of learning and the freedom given by

students to interact?

Second, Seneca students reported satisfaction with the support of teachers as less favorable than the support of independent learning. What was not clear in reflections, was why students saw teachers being as less supportive. Does less supportive teachers reflect students new to a program where teachers are accustomed to students being strongly self-directed? Or, is it that students are focused on becoming independent learners and teachers are supporting this by not being directive?

#### Other Categories

Students introduced two issues not approached in this research: The absence of young people and exit papers. The concern about young people in the program focused on how students felt about not fitting into the program due to a lack of work experience. Is this one reason why there are so few young people or is it a function of how the program markets itself?

The second issue was exit papers. Although students gave various reasons for changing the system, the basic concern was time. Exit paper research demands a large block of time from students. Students suggested however, that part of the problem with the

time required was not being prepared for the rigor of the work from course experiences, not knowing what level of work was expected, and having difficulty finding or meeting with advisors.

The problem of advisors is not isolated only to Brock. In the research of Denton et al. (1987), doctoral students also expressed similar concerns. Would more clarification of the role help students? One student suggested making this role less ad hoc but would this ease the problem, or create a new problem? Professors are a limited resource in the program, and by the descriptions that students offered of their roles in and outside of the classroom, making the role of advisor more rigid may create internal problems.

The difficulty with the suggestion of making the role of advisor less ad hoc was that students did not offer how it should be done. Whatever the organization decides, it must keep in mind that students see the program as personalized to their needs. This factor may influence student expectations of what graduate studies mean and why the program should address the issues they have raised.

### Educational Comparisons

The difficulty when comparing education programs is that no two programs are the same. This is especially true for Master studies, as was noted in Chapter One. A general pattern across findings that reflected Brock Master data findings was, as overall satisfaction was rated lower, learning and student life satisfaction was also rated lower. It is uncertain which satisfaction decrease initiates the process as each is a separate entity in this research.

In the Brock Pre-Service Teacher Education program, the lower emotional aspects of learning were not reflected in lower freedom given by the student to interact with others. A reason for this difference may be that in the Pre-Service program curriculum students are given time for group interaction. A second difference in the Pre-Service data was students favoring the domain of teachers above opportunity. This was reported in the quality of school life research reviewed in Chapter Two as a function of ex-students assessing school life from an intrinsic worth focus.

In the Manitoba Master data, students were less favorable about the quality of life experienced than

Brock Master students. What was distinctly different was satisfaction with the emotional support given learning and the freedom given by the school for students to interact. School domain results for Manitoba do not show a clear pattern of preference in the domains. What may have influenced findings is the time complexity of the program. Students registered in the Manitoba Master program were also to registered in undergraduate programs simultaneously (Clifton et al. 1987). Is the student satisfaction reported by Manitoba Master students a function of how program registration is designed? In the Brock Master program students are only in graduate school; their school life focus is only to Master study.

What is not clear in the Manitoba data is whether self-directed learning is an integral part of the program. The literature reviewed in Chapter Two suggests assessment of the quality of school life is related to learning independence. If independent learning is not the primary means of learning for students in the Master program, then another possible explanation for the differences between Brock and Manitoba Master data might be suggested.

Comparing the two Brock programs shows the difference in satisfaction when one group is higher in the education system than another. School life quality literature in Chapter Two suggest the higher students are in school, the higher the satisfaction reported. However, students share similar opinions of satisfaction about the quality of student life and different perceptions of learning satisfaction. Is the difference in learning satisfaction a function of teacher-directed learning versus learning independence?

#### Supplementary Findings

The cognitive and affective opinions of students support the pattern reported in Chapter Two. The importance of the emotional aspects of school life seems to be central to student satisfaction. What supports this satisfaction is the domains of school; the higher the satisfaction with school domains, the higher the perceived emotional support of learning and learning satisfaction.

Students in the Brock Master program suggest school life quality focused on learning acquisition. It seems necessary then that decision makers support students' emotional needs. In the program, the needs



of students seemed to focus on advisors being more than an ad hoc position, having timely and accurate information for students who have busy lives outside of school, knowing what the program standards are, and knowing what the program expects from students in terms of learning.

#### Implications For Research

The discussion suggests that the findings in this research are supported by social indicators, school life quality, school, and Master study research. It seems, however, that the more data are examined in quality of life research, the more questions emerge that remain unanswered. One means of focusing future quality of life research in schools may be through the development of a profile of what quality of life means to students in at different educational levels. A second may be to examine satisfaction from an individual perspective through the use of a statistical package that will permit an analysis of the differences between individual groups in a variable subset.

In this research, there were many general similarities to the work by Batten and Girling-Butcher (1981) and Ainley et al. (1986). Although

populations are from different school years, school systems, cultural background and geographic locations, there were similar opinions. Cantril (1965) suggested that regardless of the group, cultural orientation or geographic location, broad similarities in satisfaction perceptions of life quality occur.

Across school life quality research, shared characteristics and traits of schools to promote satisfaction focused on interaction opportunities, caring teachers, communication and course planning.

One conclusion from this research is that time, gender, motivation and expectations are important factors to consider when planning research. This research did not ask students their expectations of the school. It may be worthwhile to ask students what their expectation for their life in school is to gain a better understanding of the context of the responses being offered.

There were some basic questions that emerged from this research which students offered limited or no opinions about. For the future, more detailed research into student opinions about the quality of life in school focusing on the issues raised here may benefit schools, students and educational knowledge.

Some questions that may be considered are: (a) What are the characteristics of environmental emotional supports in an independent study program? (b) What is the role of a graduate student in contributing to satisfaction with the quality of life in a program? (c) Does graduate student learning satisfaction change as time in a program increases? (d) What are males perceptions of the emotional supports needed in a school to promote satisfaction with the quality of their life? (e) Does the design of university programs influence student life quality satisfaction? (f) What do students perceive are important organizational and personal factors that contribute to the quality of life in school? and (g) Do students perceive self-directed learning as a source of power over the quality of school life experienced?

#### Implications For Practice

This section offers to decision makers some of the questions and concerns students in the Brock Master of Education program wished to have addressed.

The Brock Master program met the suggested goal of schools in Chapter Two to transfer learning responsibility to the students. Student comments suggest the program was excellent in this perspective;

not only did the program transfer knowledge well, but its professors and multiple campuses supported student learning. The major point of concern for students focused on needing timely and accurate information about the program, what its standards are, what it expects from students, what is meant by self-directed learning and how self-directed learning is graded. These points match with student comments for the program to market itself better and to offer accurate information to potential and current students. One means of meeting this need is to assess the current calendar information and structure to clarify the descriptions or develop a graduate student handbook.

Students also focused on the need to plan course work. Providing course planning to students may not be simple. The majority of students are part time and may not wish to plan beyond one semester or two. Also, students may not know which direction their exit paper will take, which may make planning courses toward the final paper difficult. The benefit for the organization for students to plan courses would be to project future needs for classes and staff. One option is to require new students to take the core course and research course first; then offer planning.

However, the negative possibility of ordering graduate student study may be perceived by students as a loss of self-direction in learning. There was insufficient comments on planning in this research to suggest what student reaction might be or how many would like to have course work planned.

In relation to questions that arose from student comments, the organization may wish to consider addressing the following issues. First, how many and why are students registered at Brock attending other institutions? What is the impact of this on class size, academic quality, student identity with the program and financial cost to the program? Second, who does the program wish to attract in the future?

#### Conclusions and Recommendations

The opinions and reflections of students in the Brock Master of Education program indicated that the quality of life was satisfying to a majority. Most satisfying to this mainly part time student group was the organization's focus on the student. What made the quality of life less satisfying was time and unclear communications between the organization and student.

To address student concerns about communication and time, it is recommended that the faculty consider reviewing the current calendar and various information sources available to students. Assessment should focus on the information available about the philosophy and standards of the program, how the learning approach used in the program is defined, and an estimate of the hours of work part-time students may expect to need to complete course work. Written information sources available to students should also be assessed for conflicts in information and corrected. Acting upon this recommendation holds potential to help the program better market itself to future students.

In terms of research, this study reflected and supports earlier findings of school life quality satisfaction. Supplementary findings suggest that the emotional support of students is important to learning satisfaction. One question that needs answering is why males expressed less favorable responses about the quality of life in the program. Is this a trend across quality of life research or is it isolated to the Brock Master data? This research may have a greater importance at the level of high school for males.

## References

- Amos, A. (1988). The Davis academic environment: a report of student opinions (Report No. HE-021-911). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 918)
- Abbey, A., & Andrews, F. (1985). Modeling the psychological determinants of life quality. Social Indicators Research, 16, 1-34.
- Ainley, J., Reed, R., & Miller, H. (1986). School organization and the quality of schooling: A study of Victorian government secondary schools (Report No. EA-019-648). Hawthorn: Australian Council of Educational Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286 263)
- Andrews, F. (1980). Comparative studies of life quality: Comment on the current state of the art and some issues for future reference. In A. Szalai & F. Andrews (Eds.), The quality of life: comparative studies (pp. 273-286). London: Sage.
- Andrews, F. (1981). Subjective social indicators, objective social indicators, and social accounting systems. In F.T. Juster and K.C. Land (Eds.), Social accounting systems (pp. 377-419). New York: Academic.
- Andrews, F., & Inglehart, R. (1979). The structure of well-being in nine western societies. Social Indicators Research, 6, 73-90).
- Andrews, F., & McKennell, A. (1980). Measures of self-reported well-being: Their affective, cognitive and other components. Social Indicators Research, 8, 127-155.
- Andrews, F., & Withey, S. (1976). Social indicators of well-being: Americans' perceptions of life quality. New York: Plenum.
- Arlin, M., & Whithey, T. (1978). Perceptions of self-managed learning opportunities and academic locus of control: A causal interpretation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 70, 988-992.

- Atkinson, T. (1982). The stability and validity of quality of life measures. Social Indicators Research, 10, 113-132.
- Avi-Itzhak, T. (1985). The effect of membership in status group and disciplinary area on perception of university goals: A comparative analysis. College Student Journal, 14, 361-369.
- Axelrod, P. (1990). Student life in Canadian universities: The lessons of history. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 20(3), 17-28.
- Baragar, R., & Mayo-Chamberlain, J. (1983). Advisor and advisee issues in doctoral education. Journal of Higher Education, 54, 405-432.
- Barnes, W. (1968). The philosophy and literature of existentialism. Woodbury, NY: Barrons.
- Batten, M., & Girling-Butcher, S. (1981). Perceptions of the quality of school life: A case study of schools and students (Report No. EA-014-600). Hawthorn, Victoria: Australian Council for Educational Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 216 429)
- Beiser, M. (1974). Components and correlates of mental well-being. Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 15, 320-327.
- Benin, M., Stock, W., & Okun, M. (1988). Positive and negative affect: A maximum likelihood approach. Social Indicators Research, 20, 165-175.
- Bernstein, J.M. (1990). Self-knowledge as praxis: Narrative and narration in psychoanalysis. In C. Nash (Ed.), Narrative in culture: The use of storytelling in the sciences, philosophy and literature (pp. 51-80). New York: Routledge.
- Best, J., & Kahn, J. (1989). Research in education. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bharadwaj, L., & Wilkening, E. (1980). Life domain satisfaction and personal social integration. Social Indicators Research, 7, 337-351.



- Blishen, B., & Atkinson, T. (1980). Anglophone and Francophone differences in perceptions of the quality of life in Canada. In A. Szalai & F. Andrews (Eds.), The quality of life: Comparative studies (pp. 25-40). London: Sage.
- Bloom, B.S., & Krathwohl, D. (1956). Taxonomy of educational objectives. New York: David McKay.
- Boak, T., & Ellis, M. (1991). Student perceptions of quality of life in the faculty of education: Results of a survey. Brock Education, 1(2), 1-7.
- Borg, W., & Gall, M. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.
- Bradburn, N. (1969). The structure of psychological well-being. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Bradburn, N., & Caplovitz, D. (1965). Reports on Happiness. Chicago, IL: Aldine.
- Brenner, B. (1975). Quality of affect and self-evaluated happiness. Social Indicators Research, 2, 315-331.
- Britton, C.J. (1986). National graduate survey (Report No. HE-022-159). Winnipeg, Manitoba: Manitoba Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 303 130)
- Bryant, F., & Veroff, J. (1982). The structure of psychological well-being: a socio-historical analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 653-673.
- Bulcock, J., Mendoza, L., Crane, R., & Lee, T. (1989). The quality of student life in the faculty of education: the undergraduate case. Unpublished manuscript, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's.
- Burt, R.S., Wiley, J.A., Minor, M.J., & Murray, J.R. (1978). Structure of well-being. Sociological Methods and Research, 6, 365-407.
- Campbell, A. (1976). Subjective measures of well-being. American Psychologist, 31, 117-124.

- Campbell, A. (1981). The sense of well-being in America: Recent patterns and trends. New York: Russell Sage.
- Campbell, A., & Converse, P. (1980). The quality of American life, 1978. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P., & Rodgers, W. (1976). The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations and satisfactions. New York: Russell Sage.
- Campbell, R., Fleming, T., Newell, L., & Bennion, J. (1987). A history of thought and practice in educational administration. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Cantril, H. (1965). The pattern of human concerns. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers.
- Carr, W. (1989). Quality in teaching: Arguments for a reflective profession. London: Falmer.
- Chamberlain, K. (1987). On the structure of well-being. Social Indicators Research, 20, 581-604.
- Cherlin, A., & Reeder, L. (1975). The dimensions of psychological well-being: A critical review. Sociological Methods and Research, 4, 189-214.
- Clifton, R.A., Jenkinson, D., Marshall, S., Roberts, L.W., & Webster, J.B. (1987). Report of the sub-committee on students: Faculty of education university of Manitoba. Paper presented at the meeting of the Faculty Review Committee, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Coan, E. (1989). Alternative views on the evolution of consciousness. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 29, 167-199.
- Connelly, F.M., & Clandinin, D.J. (June-July, 1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. Educational Researcher, 2-13.

- Costa, P., & McCrae, R. (1980). Influence of extraversion and neuroticism on subjective well-being: Happy and unhappy people. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36, 668-678.
- Davis, D., & Ostram, T. (1987). Attitudes. Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- De Haes, J., Pennink, B., & Welvaart, K. (1987). The distinction between affect and cognition. Social Indicators Research, 19, 367-378.
- Denton, J., Tsai, C., & Chevrette, P. (1987). Quality of research experience in graduate programs as perceived by faculty, graduates and current students (Report No. TM-870-519). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 285 911)
- Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. Psychological Bulletin, 95, 542-575.
- Downey, L. (1988). Policy analysis in education. Calgary, ALB: Detselig Enterprises.
- Dunn, T., & Taylor, C. (1990). Hierarchical structures in expert performance. Educational Technology Research and Development, 38 (2), 5-18.
- Emmons, R., & Diener, E. (1985). Factors predicting satisfaction judgement: A comparative examination. Social Indicators Research, 16, 157-168.
- Epstein, J., & McPartland, J. (1976). The concept and measurement of the quality of school life. American Educational Research Journal, 13, 15-30.
- Fincher, C. (1983). Self-assessment report: the doctoral program in higher education at the University of Georgia (Report No. HE-017-310). Athens, GA: University of Georgia, Institute of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 741)
- Fry P., & Coe, K. (1980). Interaction among dimensions of academic motivation and classroom social climate: A study of the perceptions of junior high school pupils. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 50, 33-42.

- Furnham, A.F. (1990). Quantifying quality: An argument in favour of citation counts. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 14(2), 105-110.
- Gerson, E. (1976). On quality of life. American Sociological Review, 41, 793-806.
- Girves, J. & Wemmerus, V. (1988). Developing models of graduate student degree progress. Journal of Higher Education, 59, 163-189.
- Glatzer, W. (1987). Components of well-being. Social Indicators Research, 19, 23-38.
- Glatzer, W., & Mohr (1987). Quality of life: Concept and measurement. Social Indicators Research, 19, 15-23.
- Glazer, J.S. (1988). The master's degree (Report No. HE-022-078). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 301 140)
- Goodstein, L. (1987). Optimal personality. Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Goodwin, R. (1947). Dynamical coupling with especial reference to markets having production lags. Econometrica, 15, 181-185.
- Greene, M. (1967). Existential encounters for teachers. New York: Random House.
- Gruba-McCallister, F. (1991). Behaviorism and existentialism revisited: Further reflections. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 31, 75-85.
- Haley, E. (1989). Support systems for women in graduate studies. In C. Filteau (Ed.), Women in graduate studies in Ontario (pp. 32-41). Toronto: Ontario Council on Graduate Studies.
- Hankiss, E. (1980). Structural variables in cross-cultural research. In A. Szalai and F. Andrews (Eds.), The quality of life: Comparative studies (pp. 41-56). London: Sage.

- Herzog, A.R., Rodgers, W.L. & Woodworth, J. (1982). Subjective well-being among different age groups. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Holzemer, W. & Chambers, D. (1986). Doctoral education in nursing: An assessment of quality, 1979-1984 (Report No. HE-019-310). San Francisco, CA: American Educational Research Association (April 16-20). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 268 942)
- Hopkins, D., & Reid, K. (1984). Master's degree in education. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 8(1), 10-17.
- Inglehart, R., & Rabier, J.R. (1986). Aspirations adapt to situations-but why are the Belgians so much happier than the French? A cross-cultural analysis of the subjective quality of life. In F.M. Andrews (Ed.), Research on the quality of life (pp. 1-56). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Isherwood, G.B., Ahola, J.A., Hammah, C.K., & Sullivan, P. (1979). The quality of school life: A research monograph (Report No. EA-011-507). Montreal: Department of Educational Administration, McGill University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 168 216)
- Jacobson, C. (1983). A look at graduate teaching at UND: Faculty perspectives, instructional development report (Report No. HE-016-618). Grand Forks, ND: Office of Instructional Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 234 693)
- Kammann, R., Farry, M., & Herbison, R. (1984). The analysis of measurement of happiness as a sense of well-being. Social Indicators Research, 15, 91-115.
- Levitt, E. (1987). Existentialism. Concise Encyclopedia of Psychology. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Liu, B. (1975). Quality of life indicators in U.S. metropolitan areas. New York: Praeger.

- Magolda, M. (1987). The affective dimensions of learning: Faculty-student relationships that enhance intellectual development. College Student Journal, 21, 46-57.
- McCombs, B. (1991). Motivation and lifelong learning. Educational Psychologist, 26(2), 117-127.
- Michalos, A. (1983). Satisfaction and happiness in a rural northern resource community. Social Indicators Research, 13, 225-252.
- Moss, G. (1981). Factors affecting response rate and response speed in a mail survey of part-time university students. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 21, 77-89.
- Perry, W.G. (1970). Forms of intellectual and thought development in the college years: A scheme. New York: Holdt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Peterson, M.W., Cameron, K.S., Jones, P., Mets, L.A., & Ettington, D. (1986). The organizational context for teaching and learning: A review of research literature (Report No. HE-020-911). Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 287 437)
- Popkewitz, T. (1977). Educational Reform and the problems of institutional life: A theoretical paper (Report No. EA-010-428). Madison, WI: Wisconsin University Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 151 931)
- Potts, M. (1989). University enrollment in the 1980s. Canadian Social Trends, 15, 28-30.
- Roberts, L., & Clifton, R. (1987). Exploring the quality of student life: An empirical examination of undergraduate and graduate students. Unpublished manuscript, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Roberts, L., & Clifton R. (1991). Measuring the quality of life of university students. Unpublished manuscript, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg.

- Rodgers, W. (1977). Work status and the quality of life. Social Indicators Research, 4, 267-287.
- Scheer, L. (1980). Experience with quality of life comparison. In A. Szalai and F. Andrews (Eds.), The quality of life: Comparative studies (pp. 145-158). London: Sage.
- Schmidt, S. (1983). Understanding the culture of adults returning to higher education: Barriers to learning and preferred learning styles (Report No. HE-017-111). Washington, DC: Department of Agriculture. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 248)
- Schneider, K. (1986). Encountering and integrating Kierkegaard's absolute paradox. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 26, 62-80.
- Schuessler, K. & Fisher, G. (1985). Quality of life research and sociology. Annual Review of Sociology, 11, 129-149.
- Sell, G.R. (1989). An organizational perspective for the effective practice of assessment. In P.J. Gray (Ed.), Achieving assessment goals using evaluation techniques (pp. 21-43). New Directions for Higher Education, No. 67, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shuell, T. (1986). Cognitive conceptions of learning. Review of Educational Research, 56, 411-436.
- Stein, E., & Weidman, J. (1989). Graduate student scholarly activities: Gender and perceived program support (Report No. HE-022-539). San Francisco, CA: Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 309 682)
- Szalai, A., & Andrews, M. (Eds.) (1980). The quality of life: Comparative studies. London: Sage.
- Thomas, H. (1983). The demand for higher education: Problems and possibilities. Journal of Further and Higher Education, 7(1), 36-46.

- Vermunt, R., Spaans, E., & Zorge, F. (1989). Satisfaction, happiness and well-being of Dutch students. Social Indicators Research, 21, 1-33.
- Veenhoven, R. (1988). The utility of happiness. Social Indicators Research, 20, 333-354.
- Weiner, B., Russell, D., & Lerman, D. (1979). The cognition-emotion process in achievement-related contexts. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1120-1220.
- Wentzel, K.R. (1991). Social competence at school: Relations between social responsibility and academic achievement. Review of Educational Research, 61, 1-24.
- White, R., & Gagne, R. (1974). Past and future research on learning hierarchies. Educational Psychologist, 11, 19-28.
- Williams, T. (1981). The quality of school life (Report No. EA-014-068). Los Angeles, CA: Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 208 523)
- Williams, T., & Batten, M. (1981). The quality of school life. Hawthorn, Victoria: The Australian Council for Educational Research Limited.
- Wolf, F., Chandler, T., & Spies, C. (1980). Quality of school life: Cause or effect of beliefs of academic responsibility? (Report No. TM-800-665). Norfolk VA: Easter Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 194 537)
- Worthen, B.R. (1990). Program evaluation. In H.J. Walberg & G.D. Haertel (Eds.), The international encyclopedia of educational evaluation (pp. 42-47). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Yardley, J., & Rice, R. (1991). The relationship between mood and subjective well-being. Social Indicators Research, 24, 101-111.



Zevon, M., & Tellegaen, A. (1982). The structure of mood change: An idiographic/nomothetic analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43, 111-122.

## Bibliography

- Andrews, F. (1974). Social indicators of perceived life quality. Social Indicators Research, 1, 279-299.
- Andrews, F. (1986). Research on the quality of life. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Ayidiya, S., & McClendon, M. (1990). Response effects in mail surveys. Public Opinion Quarterly, 54, 229-242.
- Baird, L. (1988). A map of post-secondary assessment. Research in Higher Education, 28, 99-115.
- Beerler, K. (1991). Graduate student adjustment to academic life: A four stage framework. NASPA Journal, 28, 163-171.
- Bulmer, M. (1983). The methodology of early social indicator research: William Fielding Ogburn and recent social trends, 1933. Social Indicators Research, 13, 109-130.
- Burstein, L., Freeman, H., Sirontnik, K., Delandshere, G., & Hollis, M. (1985). Data collection: The achilles heel of evaluation research. Sociological Methods and Research, 14, 65-80.
- Connidis, I. (1984). The construct validity of the life satisfaction index and affect balance scales: A serendipitous analysis. Social Indicators Research, 15, 117-129.
- Diener, E., Sandvisk, E., Pavot, W., & Gallagher, D. (1991). Response artifacts in the measurement of subjective well-being. Social Indicators Research, 24, 35-56.
- Fox, R., Crask, M., & Kim, J. (1988). Mail survey response rate: A meta-analysis of selected techniques for inducing response. Public Opinion Quarterly, 52, 467-491.

- Frick, W. (1990). The symbolic growth experiences: A chronicle of heuristic inquiry and a quest for synthesis. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 30, 64-80.
- Gray, P.J. (Ed.). (1989). Achieving assessment goals using evaluation techniques. New Directions for Higher Education: No. 67. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hauser, R., Haller, S., Mechanic, D., & Hauser, T. (1982). Social structure and behavior. New York: Academic.
- Headely, B., Veenhoven, R., & Wearing, A. (1991). Top-down versus bottom-up theories of subjective well-being. Social Indicators Research, 24, 81-100.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1978). Toward a philosophy of administration. New York: St. Martin's.
- Kneller, G.F. (1958). Existentialism and education. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Kneller, G.F. (1964). Introduction to the philosophy of education. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Larson, R., & Emmons, R. (1985). An evaluation of subjective well-being measures. Social Indicators Research, 17, 1-17.
- Laszlo, E. (1972). Introduction to systems philosophy: Toward a new paradigm of contemporary thought. New York: Gordon and Breach.
- Leitch, T. (1986). What stories are: Narrative theory and interpretation. London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Leontief, W. (1947). Introduction to a theory of the internal structure of functional relationships. Econometrica, 15, 361-371.
- Marchese, T.J. (Fall-Winter, 1991-1992). Assessment's next five years. AIR Newsletter, 1-4.

- Mason, R., & Faulkenberry, G. (1978). Aspirations, achievements and life satisfaction. Social Indicators Research, 5, 133-150.
- McKennell, A., & Andrews, F. (1980). Models for cognition and affect in perceptions of well-being. Social Indicators Research, 8, 257-298.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). Phenomenology of perception. London: Routledge & Kegan.
- Nash, C. (Ed.). (1990). Narrative in culture: The use of storytelling in the sciences, philosophy and literature. New York: Routeledge.
- Okun, M., Brover, M. & Weir, R., (1990). Grade level differences in school satisfaction. Social Indicators Research, 22, 419-427.
- Pike, R. (1981). Sociological research on higher education in English Canada 1970-1980: A thematic review. The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 21, 1-25.
- Stinchcombe, A., & Wendt, J. (1975). Theoretical domains and measurement in social indicator analysis. In K. Land & S. Spilerman (Eds.), Social indicator models (pp.37-73). New York: Sage.
- Van Manen, M. (1990). Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy. London, ONT: Althouse.
- Wheeler, R. (1991). The theoretical and empirical structure of general well-being. Social Indicators Research, 61, 1-24.

APPENDIX A: Research Correspondence

Questionnaire and Correspondence

# QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE MASTER OF EDUCATION PROGRAM 163 BROCK UNIVERSITY

Please do not write your name anywhere on this questionnaire

This questionnaire is about your life in, and your attitudes towards, the Master of Education Program of Brock University. There are no right or wrong answers . . . I am just trying to find out how graduate students feel about their experiences in the faculty.

## PART ONE

Different people have different ideas about the overall quality of education received in the Faculty of Education. Listed below are some things that students and professors have said are important. Please remember I am interested in your honest and frank opinions.

Assess each statement by checking the response which best describes your experiences. Please remember that the phrase "As a graduate student in the Faculty of Education I have learned ... " applies to each item. That is I want you to respond in terms of your experiences in the Faculty of Education's Masters Program.

### AS A GRADUATE STUDENT IN THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION I HAVE LEARNED ...

	Definitely Agree	Mostly Agree	Neutral	Mostly Disagree	Definitely Disagree
.a considerable amount about the subjects in my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to communicate clearly the subject matter in my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to present discussions about my subjects in a systematic manner	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to analyze the theoretical perspectives of my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to synthesize the various perspectives in my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to evaluate theoretical perspectives in my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to value myself as a graduate student	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.a considerable amount about the methodologies presented in my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to speak in a clear and concise manner when discussing my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.a considerable amount of the psychological aspects of my area(s)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to write in a precise manner about my subject area(s)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to assess education from the perspective of my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to evaluate the subject area(s) I have studied	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to value the research in education	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.a considerable amount about the socio-emotional elements in my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to plan appropriate presentation activities about my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

\* Adopted from questionnaires developed by the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba

## AS A GRADUATE STUDENT IN THE FACULTY OF EDUCATION I HAVE LEARNED ...

	Definitely Agree	Mostly Agree	Neutral	Mostly Disagree	Definitely Disagree
.to evaluate my own academic performance	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to value the skills I have learned	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to analyze my area(s) of study in terms of its models	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to combine information from a number of sources	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to examine my own learning critically	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to value things I have learned about my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to use a variety of theoretical strategies	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to combine the various theoretical techniques in my area(s) of study	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.to value the Master of Education Program in the Faculty of Education	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
FINALLY, PLEASE RESPOND TO THIS OVERALL QUESTION					
.Overall, I am satisfied with my Program in The Faculty of Education	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

## PART TWO

Each item below says that The Graduate Faculty of Education is a place where some particular things happens to you or you feel a particular way. I would like to you to respond to each statement by checking one of the response categories provided. Please remember that I am interested in your honest and frank opinions.

Please read each item carefully and check the answer which best describes how you feel. Please remember that the phrase, "The Graduate Faculty of Education is a Place Where ..." applies to each item.

## THE GRADUATE FACULTY OF EDUCATION IS A PLACE WHERE ...

	Definitely Agree	Mostly Agree	Neutral	Mostly Disagree	Definitely Disagree
I feel proud to be a student	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.the things I learn are important to me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.people look up to me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.professors treat me fairly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I feel depressed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I find it easy to get to know other people	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I really get involved in my work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I like to learn	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
I enjoy being	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.students are very friendly	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

## THE GRADUATE FACULTY OF EDUCATION IS A PLACE WHERE ...

	Definitely Agree	Mostly Agree	Neutral	Mostly Disagree	Definitely Disagree
.I feel restless	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.professors give me the marks I deserve	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I have acquired skills that will be of use to me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.people care about what I think	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.professors take a personal interest in helping me with my work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I am treated with respect	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.mixing with other people helps me to understand myself	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I feel lonely	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.the things I learn will help me in my life	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.people think a lot of me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I know how to cope with work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.professors help me to do my best	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I get upset	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I know I can do well enough to be successful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.the things I am taught are worthwhile learning	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I feel important	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.professors are fair and just	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I am a success as a student	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I really like to go each day	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I learn to get along with other people	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I feel worried	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.the work I do is good for my future	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.other students accept me as I am	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I have learned to work hard	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I get on well with the other students in my class	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I find that learning is a lot of fun	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.professors listen to what I say	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
.I feel proud of myself	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

PLEASE PROCEED TO PART THREE WHICH ASKS GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF



## PART THREE

In this portion of the questionnaire I ask some factual questions about yourself. All of these answers to all of the questions are confidential. The information is required in order to make a statistical comparison between students in different core programs.

1. What is the stream or focus of your graduate study:
  - . Curriculum ..... ( )
  - . Foundations ..... ( )
  - . Administration ..... ( )
  - . Adult Education ..... ( )
2. What is your graduate student status?
  - . full time ..... ( )
  - . part time ..... ( )
3. At which location have you taken the majority of your graduate courses?
  - . Brock ..... ( )
  - . Dundas ..... ( )
  - . Park Royal ..... ( )
  - . Sheraton/Seneca Colleges ..... ( )
4. On average, what is the return distance from your home to the location where the majority of your courses have been taken? (in miles or kilometers please)
5. What graduate courses have you completed? (numbers if possible)
6. Do you believe your exit paper will be a:
  - . Thesis ..... ( )
  - . Project ..... ( )
  - . not sure ..... ( )
7. Are you a practicing teacher? Yes ( ) No ( )
  - . if NO, please go to question ELEVEN
8. If you are a practicing teacher, do you work in:
  - . the public school system ..... ( )
  - . the high school system ..... ( )
  - . a community college ..... ( )
  - . a private school ..... ( )
  - . other ..... ( )
  - (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
9. How many years have you been teaching? \_\_\_\_\_
10. At the present time does the majority of your work involve:
  - . teaching: . full time ..... ( )
  - . part time ..... ( )
  - . on leave of absence ..... ( )
  - . administration (department head) . ( )
  - . administration (principal) ..... ( )
  - . other ..... ( )
  - (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
11. If you are not a practicing teacher are you:
  - . an educational consultant ..... ( )
  - . a nurse ..... ( )
  - . other ..... ( )
  - (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
12. What was the primary motivation behind your decision to enter the graduate studies program?
13. What is the highest level of education you expect to complete?
  - . do not expect to complete Masters ( )
  - . Masters degree ..... ( )
  - . Doctoral degree ..... ( )
  - . Other ..... ( )
  - (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
14. How motivated are you to do well in your graduate courses?
 

Unmotivated \_\_\_\_\_ Very Motivated
15. Does your motivation score depend on particular graduate courses?
  - . Yes ( )
  - (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
  - . No ( )
16. What gender are you? Female ( ) Male ( )
17. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_
18. What is your ethnic origin?
  - . English ( ) . German ( )
  - . French ( ) . Native Indian ( )
  - . Italian ( ) . Other ( )
  - (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

**THANK YOU FOR BOTH YOUR TIME AND YOUR HONEST AND FRANK RESPONSES! THE LAST PAGE OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS FOR ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU MAY WISH TO MAKE. TAKE A FEW MOMENTS MORE AND JOT THEM DOWN.**

## Consent To Participate In A Recorded Interview

### Purpose of Data Collection by Interview

This interview will focus on your perceptions of "The Quality of Life in the Master of Education Program, Brock University". The information sought here is: the story of your experiences as a Master of Education student.

### Purpose of Interview

Survey data allows a generalization of student perceptions; while personal interviews can provide depth, richness and value to survey data. Telling your story will detail issues and concerns not addressed in the questionnaire.

### Assurance of Confidentiality

All recorded conversation will be heard, held, and transcribed only by myself during the entire time of the research period. Transcribed field notes will not identify the participant by name or in specific terms. A copy of the transcribed text will be sent to you for review, examination, corrections, and/or deletions. All requests for changes to field notes will be completed to the participants satisfaction before being used in the research work.

I \_\_\_\_\_ agree to  
participate in a taped interview performed by Marilyn  
Ellis on \_\_\_\_\_ for the express purpose  
of use as field notes in a study on "The Quality of  
Life in the Master of Education Program, Brock  
University". I understand I will have the final  
decision of the accuracy and inclusion of any  
conversation which occurred during the interview  
period.

Respondents Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Investigator's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Interview Question

### A Personal Story

I am researching student opinions of the quality of life they have experienced as Brock University Master of Education students.

Please tell me about your experiences as a Master of Education student in the Brock program.

May 1991

Dear Fellow Master of Education Student:

I am preparing to commence my thesis which focuses on "The Quality of Life in the Master of Education Program, Brock University". I am interested in obtaining information about graduate students in the Faculty of Education. Specifically, my research is to examine the following objectives:

1. the entering characteristics of M.Ed. students
2. the perceptions M.Ed. students have of the quality of the Master of Education Program
3. the perceptions M.Ed. students have of the quality of life in the Faculty of Education
4. what M.Ed. students perceive as required to improve the overall quality of the Master of Education program

The questionnaire will take about forty-five minutes to complete. PLEASE NOTE: Questions are printed on both sides of each page. I encourage each of you to complete the questionnaire in order that I can obtain the breadth of information that the whole group of M.Ed. students can provide. In gaining an understanding of M.Ed. students thoughts, needs, and concerns both the students and the program can benefit. The more valid the data gathered the more confidence I can place in it and the stronger the support of the evaluation of the M.Ed. program can be. Would you please complete the questions as soon as possible. Included with this letter is a questionnaire and a return stamped envelope.

Thank you very much for your participation. A copy of the thesis will be available for general review in both libraries at the completion of the work.

Yours sincerely,

Marilyn Ellis  
Educational Administration  
Brock campus

FROM: DAVID DIBATTISTA, CHAIR  
STANDING SUB-COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH WITH HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

TO: T. BOAK, FACULTY OF EDUCATION

DATE: APRIL 15, 1991

THE BROCK UNIVERSITY STANDING SUB-COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH WITH HUMAN PARTICIPANTS HAS CAREFULLY REVIEWED THE FOLLOWING RESEARCH PROPOSAL:

QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE MASTER OF EDUCATION PROGRAM: BROCK UNIVERSITY, BY ELLIS AND BOAK

THE SUB-COMMITTEE FINDS THIS PROPOSAL TO CONFORM TO THE BROCK UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES FOR ETHICAL RESEARCH.

*David D. Battista*

## APPENDIX B: Detailed Survey Results

Index of Tables in Appendix B  
Data Sets of Variables in the Research

## Index to Appendix B

	Page
Table B-1: The Quality of Life in the Brock Master of Education Program	173
Table B-2: The Quality of Life for Females	179
Table B-3: The Quality of Life for Males	185
Table B-4: The Quality of Life for Part-Time	191
Table B-5: The Quality of Life for Full-Time	197
Table B-6: The Quality of Life for Foundations	203
Table B-7: The Quality of Life for Curriculum	209
Table B-8: The Quality of Life for Administration	215
Table B-9: The Quality of Life for Adult Education	221
Table B-10: The Quality of Life at Park Royal	227
Table B-11: The Quality of Life at Dundas/McMaster	233
Table B-12: The Quality of Life at Brock	239
Table B-13: The Quality of Life at Seneca/Sheridan	245
Table B-14: Comparison of the Quality of Life in Master Programs	251
Table B-15: Comparison of the Quality of Life in the Faculty of Education, Brock University	257

Table B-1. The Quality of Life in the Brock Master Program (N = 370).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	87.0	10.0	3.0
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	86.4	9.8	3.8
. a considerable amount about methodology	71.4	22.8	5.8
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	53.1	34.9	12.0
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	51.5	36.8	11.7
M	65.6	26.1	8.3
SD	16.5	12.5	4.1
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	78.0	19.0	3.0
. to write in a precise manner	78.1	17.3	4.6
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	70.8	23.2	6.0
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	64.2	28.7	7.0
M	72.8	22.0	5.1
SD	6.6	5.0	1.7



Table B-1. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	76.1	18.5	5.4
. to evaluate my academic performance	83.5	13.0	3.5
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	67.3	24.3	8.4
M	75.6	18.6	5.8
SD	8.1	5.6	2.4
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	77.0	18.7	4.3
. to assess education from the perspective of my study area	87.0	10.6	2.4
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	70.0	23.2	6.8
M	78.0	17.5	4.5
SD	8.5	6.3	2.2
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	79.7	16.8	3.5
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	87.4	11.5	1.1
. to combine various theoretical techniques	70.4	22.2	7.4
. to combine information from a number of sources	91.6	6.8	1.6
M	82.3	14.3	3.4
SD	9.3	6.6	2.8

Table B-1. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	79.3	16.3	4.3
. to evaluate the subject area studied	88.3	9.5	2.2
. to examine my own learning critically	87.3	8.4	4.3
M	85.0	11.4	3.6
SD	4.9	4.2	1.2
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	83.7	12.5	3.8
. to value research in education	83.4	14.2	2.4
. to value the skills I have learned	87.2	10.6	2.2
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	88.1	9.5	2.4
. to value the Master of Education Program	82.2	15.3	2.5
M	84.9	12.5	2.6
SD	2.5	2.4	0.6

Table B-1. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	69.9	20.3	9.8
. I enjoy being	77.0	19.2	3.8
. students are very friendly	83.7	12.7	3.5
. I really like to go each day	66.1	25.6	8.3
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	81.0	14.7	4.3
M	75.5	18.6	5.9
SD	7.4	5.0	2.9
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	3.0	6.8	90.3
. I feel restless	9.8	21.6	68.6
. I feel lonely	6.5	9.5	84.0
. I get upset	9.0	12.7	78.3
. I feel worried	9.5	15.0	75.5
M	7.6	13.1	79.3
SD	2.8	5.6	8.2

Table B-1. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	83.0	14.6	2.4
. people look up to me	37.1	47.4	15.4
. people care about what I think	79.3	18.2	2.4
. I am treated with respect	87.0	11.6	1.4
. people think a lot of me	41.4	51.0	7.6
. I feel important	57.9	37.0	5.1
. I feel proud of myself	86.9	10.9	2.2
. I get on well with other students in my class	93.2	6.3	0.5
<u>M</u>	70.7	24.6	4.6
<u>SD</u>	22.0	17.7	4.9
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	92.2	5.4	2.4
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	76.1	17.4	6.5
. I am a success as a student	95.7	3.8	0.5
. I learn to get along with other people	63.1	29.0	7.9
. other students accept me as I am	86.1	13.6	0.3
. I have learned to work hard	73.0	21.0	6.0
<u>M</u>	81.0	15.0	4.0
<u>SD</u>	12.4	9.5	3.2

Table B-1. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	89.9	8.7	1.4
. give me the marks I deserve	92.1	6.5	1.4
. take a personal interest	79.6	14.7	5.7
. help me to do my best	74.4	18.8	6.8
. are fair and just	89.7	8.4	1.9
. listen to what I say	86.4	11.7	1.9
M	85.3	11.5	3.2
SD	6.9	4.6	2.4
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	84.2	11.7	4.1
. I like to learn	93.2	5.7	1.1
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	86.8	9.9	3.3
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	94.6	4.1	1.4
. the things I learn will help me in my life	79.6	16.0	4.3
. I know how to cope with work	85.3	10.1	4.6
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	82.3	12.8	4.9
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	95.1	3.8	1.1
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	87.2	9.3	3.5
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	85.6	11.4	3.0
M	87.4	9.5	3.1
SD	5.2	3.9	1.4

Table B-2. The Quality of Life for Females (n = 283).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	88.7	9.2	2.1
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	86.9	9.6	3.5
. a considerable amount about methodology	71.9	24.4	4.7
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	54.3	35.7	10.0
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	52.7	37.7	9.6
M	66.4	26.6	6.9
SD	16.1	12.9	3.3
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	80.9	18.1	1.1
. to write in a precise manner	78.8	18.0	3.2
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	72.9	22.5	4.6
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	65.6	29.4	5.0
M	74.5	22.0	3.4
SD	6.8	5.3	1.7

Table B-2. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	79.0	17.1	3.1
. to evaluate my academic performance	72.9	22.5	4.6
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	68.6	25.4	6.1
M	73.5	21.6	4.8
SD	5.2	4.2	1.1
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	78.0	18.4	3.5
. to assess education from the perspective of my study area	86.9	10.6	2.5
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	71.1	23.2	5.7
M	78.6	17.4	3.9
SD	7.9	6.3	1.6
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	83.3	13.5	3.2
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	88.6	10.7	0.7
. to combine various theoretical techniques	72.0	22.9	5.0
. to combine information from a number of sources	94.7	4.6	0.7
M	84.6	12.9	2.4
SD	9.6	7.6	2.1

Table B-2. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	80.8	15.3	3.9
. to evaluate the subject area studied	89.0	9.3	1.8
. to examine my own learning critically	90.1	7.1	2.8
<u>M</u>	86.6	10.5	2.8
<u>SD</u>	5.1	4.2	1.0
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	87.1	10.7	2.1
. to value research in education	84.7	13.9	1.4
. to value the skills I have learned	88.3	10.3	1.4
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	90.8	8.5	0.7
. to value the Master of Education Program in the Faculty of Education	86.0	12.9	1.1
<u>M</u>	87.3	11.2	1.3
<u>SD</u>	2.3	2.1	0.5



Table B-2. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	72.7	18.8	8.5
. I enjoy being	79.9	17.6	2.5
. students are very friendly	83.0	14.2	2.8
. I really like to go each day	69.0	24.2	6.9
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	83.6	12.8	3.6
M	77.6	17.5	4.8
SD	6.4	4.4	2.6
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	2.5	6.7	90.8
. I feel restless	8.9	19.9	71.3
. I feel lonely	7.1	8.2	84.7
. I get upset	9.3	12.8	77.9
. I feel worried	10.7	13.9	75.4
M	7.7	12.3	80.0
SD	3.1	5.2	7.7

Table B-2. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	83.3	14.5	2.1
. people look up to me	37.6	47.5	14.9
. people care about what I think	81.1	16.7	2.1
. I am treated with respect	87.2	11.3	1.4
. people think a lot of me	42.1	51.8	6.1
. I feel important	59.4	37.0	3.6
. I feel proud of myself	89.3	8.9	1.9
. I get on well with other students in my class	93.9	6.1	0.0
M	71.7	24.2	4.0
SD	22.2	18.3	4.7
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	94.0	4.3	1.8
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	77.5	16.8	5.7
. I am a success as a student	96.8	2.8	0.4
. I learn to get along with other people	63.7	29.5	6.8
. other students accept me as I am	87.9	12.1	0.0
. I have learned to work hard	76.7	19.7	3.6
M	82.7	14.2	3.0
SD	12.4	10.0	2.8

Table B-2. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	90.4	8.6	1.1
. give me the marks I deserve	91.9	6.7	0.7
. take a personal interest	79.7	14.2	6.0
. help me to do my best	74.0	18.5	7.5
. are fair and just	90.0	8.2	1.8
. listen to what I say	86.5	11.7	1.8
M	85.4	11.3	3.1
SD	7.1	4.4	2.8
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	85.8	11.7	2.5
. I like to learn	94.7	5.0	0.4
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	88.2	9.6	2.1
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	96.1	3.2	0.7
. the things I learn will help me in my life	81.5	14.9	3.6
. I know how to cope with work	86.5	8.5	5.0
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	84.6	11.1	4.3
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	95.7	3.6	0.7
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	89.3	7.9	2.7
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	87.2	11.0	1.8
M	88.9	8.6	2.3
SD	4.9	3.8	1.5

Table B-3. The Quality of Life for Males (n = 86).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	81.2	12.9	5.9
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	84.9	10.5	4.7
. a considerable amount about methodology	69.4	21.2	9.4
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	48.8	32.6	18.6
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	47.1	34.1	18.8
M	62.6	24.6	12.8
SD	18.0	11.0	6.9
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	68.6	22.1	9.3
. to write in a precise manner	75.6	5.15	9.3
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	63.5	25.9	10.6
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	59.3	26.7	14.0
M	66.7	22.4	10.8
SD	7.0	5.2	2.2

Table B-3. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	66.3	23.3	10.5
. to evaluate my academic performance	63.5	25.9	10.6
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	62.8	20.9	16.3
M	64.2	23.3	12.4
SD	1.8	2.5	3.3
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	73.3	19.8	7.0
. to assess education from the perspective of my study area	87.2	10.5	2.3
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	66.3	23.3	10.5
M	75.6	17.8	6.6
SD	10.6	6.6	4.1
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	67.4	27.9	4.7
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	83.5	14.1	2.4
. to combine various theoretical techniques	64.7	20.0	15.3
. to combine information from a number of sources	81.4	14.0	4.7
M	74.2	19.0	6.7
SD	9.5	6.5	5.9

Table B-3. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	74.4	14.8	5.8
. to evaluate the subject area studied	85.9	10.6	3.8
. to examine my own learning critically	77.9	12.9	9.3
M	79.4	14.4	6.3
SD	5.8	4.7	2.7
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	72.1	18.6	9.3
. to value research in education	78.8	15.3	5.9
. to value the skills I have learned	83.7	11.6	4.7
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	79.1	12.8	8.1
. to value the Master of Education Program in the Faculty of Education	69.8	23.3	7.0
M	76.7	16.3	7.0
SD	5.6	4.7	1.8

Table B-3. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	61.6	24.0	14.0
. I enjoy being	67.1	24.7	8.2
. students are very friendly	86.0	8.1	5.8
. I really like to go each day	56.1	30.5	13.4
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	72.1	20.9	7.0
M	68.5	21.6	9.7
SD	11.4	8.3	3.7
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	4.7	7.0	88.4
. I feel restless	12.8	27.9	59.3
. I feel lonely	4.7	14.0	81.4
. I get upset	8.1	12.8	79.1
. I feel worried	5.8	18.6	75.6
M	7.2	16.0	76.7
SD	3.4	7.8	10.8

Table B-3. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	81.4	15.1	3.5
. people look up to me	34.9	47.7	17.4
. people care about what I think	73.3	23.3	3.5
. I am treated with respect	86.0	12.8	1.2
. people think a lot of me	38.4	48.8	12.8
. I feel important	52.3	37.2	10.5
. I feel proud of myself	79.1	17.4	3.5
. I get on well with other students in my class	90.7	7.1	2.3
M	67.0	26.2	6.8
SD	21.9	16.2	5.9
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	86.0	9.3	4.7
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	70.9	19.8	9.3
. I am a success as a student	91.9	7.0	1.2
. I learn to get along with other people	60.5	27.9	11.6
. other students accept me as I am	80.2	18.6	1.2
. I have learned to work hard	61.6	25.6	12.8
M	75.2	18.0	6.8
SD	12.9	8.4	5.1



Table B-3. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	88.4	9.3	2.3
. give me the marks I deserve	90.7	5.8	3.5
. take a personal interest	73.3	23.3	3.5
. help me to do my best	75.3	20.0	4.7
. are fair and just	88.4	9.3	2.3
. listen to what I say	86.0	11.6	2.3
M	83.7	13.2	3.1
SD	7.4	6.8	0.9
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	79.1	11.6	9.3
. I like to learn	88.4	8.1	3.5
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	82.1	10.7	7.1
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	89.4	7.1	3.5
. the things I learn will help me in my life	73.3	19.8	7.0
. I know how to cope with work	81.4	15.1	3.5
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	74.4	18.6	7.0
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	92.9	4.7	2.4
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	80.2	14.0	5.8
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	80.2	12.8	7.0
M	82.1	12.3	5.6
SD	6.3	4.8	1.9

Table B-4. The Quality of Life for Part-Time  
(n = 354).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	86.6	10.6	2.8
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	86.4	9.9	3.7
. a considerable amount about methodology	70.3	23.6	6.1
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	51.7	35.7	12.6
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	49.7	38.0	12.3
<u>M</u>	64.5	26.8	8.7
<u>SD</u>	17.2	12.9	4.4
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	79.0	17.9	3.1
. to write in a precise manner	77.9	17.5	4.6
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	70.5	23.5	6.0
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	64.2	28.4	7.4
<u>M</u>	72.9	21.8	5.3
<u>SD</u>	6.9	5.1	1.8

Table B-4. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	76.4	18.2	5.4
. to evaluate my academic performance	83.0	13.3	3.7
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	66.6	24.5	8.9
M	75.3	18.7	6.0
SD	8.2	5.6	2.6
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	76.7	19.0	4.3
. to assess education from the perspective of my study area	86.4	11.1	2.6
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	69.4	23.4	7.2
M	77.5	17.8	4.7
SD	8.5	6.2	2.3
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	79.5	17.1	3.4
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	86.8	12.1	1.1
. to combine various theoretical techniques	69.5	22.7	7.8
. to combine information from a number of sources	91.5	6.8	1.7
M	81.8	14.7	3.5
SD	9.5	6.8	3.0

Table B-4. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	79.3	16.2	4.5
. to evaluate the subject area studied	87.7	10.0	2.3
. to examine my own learning critically	87.2	8.3	4.5
M	84.7	11.5	3.8
SD	4.7	4.1	1.2
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	82.9	13.1	4.0
. to value research in education	82.8	14.6	2.6
. to value the skills I have learned	86.6	11.1	2.3
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	87.7	9.7	2.6
. to value the Master of Education Program	82.0	15.4	2.6
M	84.4	12.8	2.8
SD	2.5	2.3	0.6

Table B-4. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	70.5	19.6	9.9
. I enjoy being	76.4	19.6	4.0
. students are very friendly	83.5	13.1	3.4
. I really like to go each day	64.8	26.5	8.7
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	80.3	15.1	4.6
M	75.1	18.8	6.1
SD	7.5	5.1	2.9
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	2.8	6.8	90.3
. I feel restless	9.9	21.3	68.8
. I feel lonely	6.2	8.8	84.9
. I get upset	8.0	12.5	79.5
. I feel worried	8.6	14.9	76.5
M	7.1	12.9	80.0
SD	2.7	5.6	8.1

Table B-4. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	82.1	15.3	2.6
. people look up to me	36.1	48.3	15.6
. people care about what I think	79.2	18.2	2.6
. I am treated with respect	86.7	11.9	1.4
. people think a lot of me	40.6	51.7	7.7
. I feel important	57.0	37.6	5.4
. I feel proud of myself	86.6	11.1	2.3
. I get on well with other students in my class	92.8	6.6	0.6
M	70.1	25.1	4.8
SD	22.3	21.0	4.9
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	91.7	5.7	2.6
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	75.4	17.7	6.9
. I am a success as a student	95.4	4.0	0.6
. I learn to get along with other people	62.4	29.3	8.3
. other students accept me as I am	86.0	13.7	0.3
. I have learned to work hard	73.1	21.2	5.7
M	80.7	15.3	4.0
SD	12.5	9.5	3.3

Table B-4. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	89.7	8.9	1.4
. give me the marks I deserve	91.7	6.9	1.4
. take a personal interest	78.9	15.1	6.0
. help me to do my best	74.0	19.4	6.6
. are fair and just	89.7	8.3	2.0
. listen to what I say	86.0	12.0	2.0
M	85.0	11.8	3.2
SD	7.0	4.7	2.3
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	83.8	12.0	4.3
. I like to learn	92.9	6.0	1.1
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	86.2	10.3	3.5
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	94.6	4.0	1.4
. the things I learn will help me in my life	78.6	16.8	4.6
. I know how to cope with work	84.9	10.3	4.8
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	81.4	13.4	5.2
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	94.9	4.0	1.1
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	86.6	9.7	3.7
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	84.9	12.0	3.1
M	86.9	9.9	3.2
SD	5.5	4.1	1.5

Table B-5. The Quality of Life for Full-Time  
(n = 16).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied with my program	93.8	0.0	6.2
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	87.5	6.3	6.2
. a considerable amount about methodology	93.8	6.2	0.0
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	81.2	18.8	0.0
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	87.5	12.5	0.0
M	87.5	11.0	1.5
SD	5.1	6.0	2.9
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	56.2	43.8	0.0
. to write in a precise manner	81.3	12.5	6.2
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	75.0	18.8	6.2
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	62.5	37.5	0.0
M	68.8	28.2	3.0
SD	11.4	14.8	3.5



Table B-5. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	68.8	25.0	6.2
. to evaluate my academic performance	93.8	6.2	0.0
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	81.2	18.8	0.0
M	81.3	16.7	2.0
SD	12.5	9.5	3.5
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	81.3	12.5	6.2
. to assess education from my perspective of study	100.0	0.0	0.0
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	81.2	18.8	0.0
M	87.5	10.5	2.0
SD	10.8	9.5	3.5
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	81.3	12.5	6.2
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	100.0	0.0	0.0
. to combine various theoretical techniques	87.5	12.5	0.0
. to combine information from a number of sources	93.8	6.2	0.0
M	90.7	7.8	1.5
SD	8.0	5.9	3.1

Table B-5. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	80.0	20.0	0.0
. to evaluate the subject area studied	100.0	0.0	0.0
. to examine my own learning critically	87.5	12.5	0.0
<u>M</u>	89.2	10.8	0.0
<u>SD</u>	10.1	10.1	0.0
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	100.0	0.0	0.0
. to value research in education	93.8	6.2	0.0
. to value the skills I have learned	100.0	0.0	0.0
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	93.8	6.2	0.0
. to value the Master of Education Program	86.7	13.3	0.0
<u>M</u>	94.9	5.1	0.0
<u>SD</u>	5.5	5.5	0.0

Table B-5. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	62.5	31.3	5.6
. I enjoy being	87.5	12.5	0.0
. students are very friendly	87.6	6.2	6.2
. I really like to go each day	93.3	6.7	0.0
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	93.8	6.2	0.0
<b>M</b>	84.9	12.6	2.5
<b>SD</b>	12.9	10.8	4.8
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	6.2	6.2	87.6
. I feel restless	6.2	31.3	62.5
. I feel lonely	12.5	25.0	62.5
. I get upset	31.2	18.8	50.0
. I feel worried	31.2	18.8	50.0
<b>M</b>	17.5	20.0	62.5
<b>SD</b>	12.8	9.3	6.8

Table B-5. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	100.0	0.0	0.0
. people look up to me	56.3	31.2	12.5
. people care about what I think	81.2	18.8	0.0
. I am treated with respect	93.8	6.3	0.0
. people think a lot of me	56.3	37.5	6.2
. I feel important	75.0	25.0	0.0
. I feel proud of myself	93.8	6.2	0.0
. I get on well with other students in my class	100.0	0.0	0.0
M	82.1	15.6	2.3
SD	18.1	14.5	1.6
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	100.0	0.0	0.0
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	87.5	12.5	0.0
. I am a success as a student	100.0	0.0	0.0
. I learn to get along with other people	75.0	25.0	0.0
. other students accept me as I am	87.5	12.5	0.0
. I have learned to work hard	75.0	18.8	6.2
M	87.5	11.5	1.0
SD	11.1	10.2	2.5

Table B-5. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	93.3	6.7	0.0
. give me the marks I deserve	100.0	0.0	0.0
. take a personal interest	93.8	6.2	0.0
. help me to do my best	81.3	6.2	12.5
. are fair and just	87.5	12.5	0.0
. listen to what I say	93.8	6.2	0.0
M	91.6	6.3	2.1
SD	6.4	3.9	5.1
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	93.8	6.2	0.0
. I like to learn	100.0	0.0	0.0
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	100.0	0.0	0.0
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	93.3	6.7	0.0
. the things I learn will help me in my life	100.0	0.0	0.0
. I know how to cope with work	93.8	6.2	0.0
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	100.0	0.0	0.0
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	100.0	0.0	0.0
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	100.0	0.0	0.0
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	100.0	0.0	0.0
M	98.1	1.9	0.0
SD	3.0	3.0	0.0

Table B-6. The Quality of Life in Foundations  
(n = 101).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	96.0	4.0	0.0
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	85.1	12.9	2.0
. a considerable amount about methodology	74.5	22.4	3.1
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	67.0	22.0	11.0
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	61.0	29.0	10.0
M	71.9	21.6	6.5
SD	10.4	6.6	4.6
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	80.2	17.8	2.0
. to write in a precise manner	77.0	19.0	4.0
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	72.3	21.8	5.9
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	65.3	31.7	3.0
M	73.7	22.6	3.7
SD	6.5	6.3	1.7

Table B-6. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	80.2	14.9	5.0
. to evaluate my academic performance	84.2	12.9	3.0
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	70.7	23.2	6.1
<b>M</b>	78.3	17.0	4.7
<b>SD</b>	6.9	5.5	1.6
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	76.2	20.8	3.0
. to assess education from the perspective of my study area	92.1	6.9	1.0
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	70.0	26.0	4.0
<b>M</b>	79.4	17.9	2.7
<b>SD</b>	11.4	9.9	1.5
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	84.2	12.9	3.0
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	88.1	10.9	1.0
. to combine various theoretical techniques	74.7	23.2	2.0
. to combine information from a number of sources	94.0	6.0	0.0
<b>M</b>	85.3	13.2	1.5
<b>SD</b>	8.1	7.2	1.3

Table B-6. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	82.2	15.8	2.0
. to evaluate the subject area studied	87.1	9.9	3.0
. to examine my own learning critically	93.1	5.9	1.0
M	87.5	10.5	2.0
SD	5.5	4.9	1.0
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	89.1	9.9	1.0
. to value research in education	85.0	14.0	1.0
. to value the skills I have learned	90.1	8.9	1.0
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	91.1	7.9	1.0
. to value the Master of Education Program	90.1	9.9	0.0
M	89.1	10.1	0.8
SD	2.4	2.3	0.4



Table B-6. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	70.3	17.8	11.9
. I enjoy being	80.0	20.0	0.0
. students are very friendly	84.2	11.9	4.0
. I really like to go each day	65.3	26.5	8.2
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	86.1	9.9	4.0
M	77.2	17.2	5.6
SD	9.0	6.6	4.5
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	1.0	4.0	95.0
. I feel restless	6.9	27.7	65.3
. I feel lonely	6.9	6.9	86.1
. I get upset	8.9	11.9	79.2
. I feel worried	8.0	15.0	77.0
M	6.3	13.2	80.5
SD	3.1	9.2	11.0

Table B-6. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	88.1	10.9	1.0
. people look up to me	40.6	49.5	9.9
. people care about what I think	86.1	11.9	2.0
. I am treated with respect	92.1	6.9	1.0
. people think a lot of me	42.0	53.0	5.0
. I feel important	62.4	33.7	4.0
. I feel proud of myself	96.0	3.0	1.0
. I get on well with other students in my class	96.0	4.0	0.0
M	75.4	21.6	3.0
SD	23.6	20.7	3.2
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	95.0	5.0	0.0
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	80.2	10.9	8.9
. I am a success as a student	100.0	0.0	0.0
. I learn to get along with other people	60.4	26.7	12.9
. other students accept me as I am	91.1	8.9	0.0
. I have learned to work hard	78.2	16.8	5.0
M	84.2	11.4	4.4
SD	14.3	9.4	5.5

Table B-6. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	91.0	9.0	0.0
. give me the marks I deserve	87.1	10.9	2.0
. take a personal interest	81.2	9.9	8.9
. help me to do my best	71.3	19.8	8.9
. are fair and just	92.1	6.9	1.0
. listen to what I say	91.1	6.9	2.0
M	85.6	10.6	3.8
SD	8.1	4.8	4.0
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	90.0	8.0	2.0
. I like to learn	98.0	2.0	0.0
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	89.0	10.0	1.0
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	94.1	4.0	2.0
. the things I learn will help me in my life	81.2	17.8	1.0
. I know how to cope with work	83.2	11.9	5.0
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	82.2	11.9	5.9
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	98.0	0.0	2.0
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	88.0	8.0	4.0
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	89.1	8.9	2.0
M	89.3	8.3	2.4
SD	6.1	5.2	1.9

Table B-7. The Quality of Life in Curriculum  
(n = 140).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	87.1	12.1	0.7
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	88.6	8.6	2.9
. a considerable amount about methodology	75.4	20.3	4.3
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	47.5	41.0	11.5
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	47.1	40.7	12.1
<u>M</u>	64.7	27.6	7.7
<u>SD</u>	20.7	15.9	4.7
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	80.0	17.9	2.1
. to write in a precise manner	80.6	15.1	4.3
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	70.5	23.7	5.8
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	71.4	22.1	6.4
<u>M</u>	75.6	19.7	4.7
<u>SD</u>	5.4	3.9	1.9

Table B-7. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	77.0	18.7	4.3
. to evaluate my academic performance	85.7	10.7	3.6
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	67.9	24.3	7.9
M	76.9	17.9	5.2
SD	8.9	6.9	2.3
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	78.6	20.0	1.4
. to assess education from the perspective of my study area	87.1	10.7	2.1
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	71.2	23.0	5.8
M	79.0	17.9	3.1
SD	7.9	6.4	2.3
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	80.0	19.3	0.7
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	89.9	10.1	0.0
. to combine various theoretical techniques	71.2	20.9	7.9
. to combine information from a number of sources	92.1	7.1	0.7
M	83.3	14.4	2.3
SD	9.6	6.7	3.7

Table B-7. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	82.0	12.9	5.0
. to evaluate the subject area studied	89.3	9.3	1.4
. to examine my own learning critically	88.6	8.6	2.9
M	86.6	10.3	3.1
SD	4.0	2.3	1.8
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	87.7	9.4	2.9
. to value research in education	83.6	12.9	3.6
. to value the skills I have learned	90.6	7.9	1.4
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	90.0	7.9	2.1
. to value the Master of Education program	81.9	16.7	1.4
M	86.8	11.0	2.2
SD	3.8	3.8	0.9

Table B-7. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	68.6	23.6	7.9
. I enjoy being	76.8	18.1	5.1
. students are very friendly	87.1	11.4	1.4
. I really like to go each day	68.1	23.9	8.0
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	80.7	15.7	3.6
M	76.3	18.5	5.2
SD	8.1	5.3	2.8
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	2.1	7.1	90.7
. I feel restless	9.3	17.1	73.6
. I feel lonely	5.0	10.7	84.3
. I get upset	6.4	11.4	82.1
. I feel worried	10.7	15.7	73.6
M	6.7	12.4	80.9
SD	3.4	4.0	7.3

Table B-7. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	84.3	14.3	1.4
. people look up to me	39.3	40.0	20.7
. people care about what I think	78.6	20.0	1.4
. I am treated with respect	87.9	12.1	0.0
. people think a lot of me	43.6	49.3	7.1
. I feel important	57.1	39.3	3.6
. I feel proud of myself	84.3	12.9	2.9
. I get on well with other students in my class	90.7	8.6	0.7
M	70.7	24.6	4.7
SD	20.8	15.7	6.8
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	95.7	2.9	1.4
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	75.7	20.0	4.3
. I am a success as a student	95.7	3.6	0.7
. I learn to get along with other people	69.6	27.5	2.9
. other students accept me as I am	86.4	13.6	0.0
. I have learned to work hard	73.4	23.0	3.6
M	82.7	15.1	2.2
SD	11.4	10.2	1.7



Table B-7. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	92.8	6.5	0.7
. give me the marks I deserve	95.0	3.6	1.4
marks I deserve			
. take a personal interest	80.0	18.6	1.4
. help me to do my best	80.0	19.3	0.7
. are fair and just	89.3	10.0	0.7
. listen to what I say	85.0	14.3	0.7
I say			
M	87.0	12.1	0.9
SD	6.4	6.4	0.3
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in	81.4	15.0	3.6
my work			
. I like to learn	92.9	5.7	1.4
. I acquired skills that will	89.9	7.9	2.2
be of use to me			
. I achieve a satisfactory	95.0	4.3	0.7
standard in my work			
. the things I learn will	79.3	16.4	4.3
help me in my life			
. I know how to cope with work	90.0	5.0	5.0
. I am given the chance to do	84.9	12.9	2.2
work that really interests me			
. I know I can do well enough	96.4	2.9	0.7
to be successful			
. the things I am taught are	87.9	10.7	1.4
worthwhile			
. the work I do is good	82.1	15.0	2.9
preparation for my future			
M	88.0	9.6	2.4
SD	5.9	5.0	1.4

Table B-8. The Quality of Life in Administration  
(n = 107).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	80.4	12.1	7.5
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	86.9	8.4	4.7
. a considerable amount about methodology	69.2	22.4	8.4
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	46.7	39.3	14.0
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	49.1	37.7	13.2
<u>M</u>	63.0	26.9	10.1
<u>SD</u>	18.8	14.5	4.3
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	78.5	16.8	4.7
. to write in a precise manner	79.4	16.8	3.7
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	71.4	23.8	4.8
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	59.8	30.8	9.3
<u>M</u>	72.2	22.1	5.7
<u>SD</u>	9.0	6.7	2.5

Table B-8. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	77.6	17.8	4.7
. to evaluate my academic performance	82.2	13.1	4.7
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	67.3	22.4	10.3
M	75.7	17.8	6.5
SD	7.6	4.6	3.2
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	76.6	16.8	6.5
. to assess education from the perspective of my study area	81.3	15.0	3.7
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	72.0	17.8	10.3
M	76.6	16.6	6.8
SD	4.6	1.4	3.3
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	78.5	15.9	5.6
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	84.0	14.2	1.9
. to combine various theoretical techniques	67.9	22.6	9.4
. to combine information from a number of sources	88.8	7.5	3.7
M	79.8	15.1	5.1
SD	8.9	6.2	3.2

Table B-8. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	72.0	23.4	4.7
. to evaluate the subject area studied	91.4	6.7	1.9
. to examine my own learning critically	81.3	9.3	9.3
M	81.6	13.1	5.3
SD	9.7	8.9	3.7
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	74.8	19.6	5.6
. to value research in education	84.0	14.2	1.9
. to value the skills I have learned	85.0	11.2	3.7
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	84.1	12.1	3.7
. to value the Master of Education program	77.4	17.9	4.7
M	81.0	15.0	4.0
SD	4.6	3.6	1.3

Table B-8. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	71.0	17.8	11.2
. I enjoy being	79.2	15.1	5.7
. students are very friendly	81.3	13.1	5.6
. I really like to go each day	67.0	23.3	9.7
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	79.2	16.0	4.7
M	75.5	17.1	7.4
SD	6.1	3.8	2.8
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	5.6	8.4	86.0
. I feel restless	11.2	20.6	68.2
. I feel lonely	6.6	10.4	83.0
. I get upset	9.4	15.1	75.5
. I feel worried	8.5	15.1	76.4
M	8.3	13.9	77.8
SD	2.2	4.7	6.9

Table B-8. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	79.4	16.8	3.7
. people look up to me	33.6	52.3	14.0
. people care about what I think	75.4	21.7	3.8
. I am treated with respect	83.2	14.0	2.8
. people think a lot of me	39.6	48.1	12.3
. I feel important	59.4	32.1	8.5
. I feel proud of myself	83.0	14.2	2.8
. I get on well with other students in my class	93.3	5.7	1.0
M	68.4	25.6	6.0
SD	21.8	16.9	4.8
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	86.9	7.5	5.6
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	75.5	17.9	6.6
. I am a success as a student	92.5	6.5	0.9
. I learn to get along with other people	58.5	32.1	9.4
. other students accept me as I am	83.0	16.0	0.9
. I have learned to work hard	67.6	23.8	8.6
M	77.3	17.3	5.4
SD	12.7	9.7	3.6

Table B-8. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	86.0	11.2	2.8
. give me the marks I deserve	92.5	6.5	0.9
. take a personal in helping	80.2	12.3	7.5
. help me to do my best	72.6	17.0	10.4
. are fair and just	88.7	8.5	2.8
. listen to what I say	84.0	13.2	2.8
M	84.0	11.5	4.5
SD	6.9	3.6	3.6
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	82.2	10.3	7.5
. I like to learn	90.7	7.5	1.8
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	81.0	12.4	6.6
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	95.3	2.8	1.9
. the things I learn will help me in my life	78.3	13.2	8.5
. I know how to cope with work	84.0	12.3	3.7
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	81.1	12.3	6.6
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	93.3	5.7	1.0
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	85.8	8.5	5.7
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	85.8	9.4	4.8
M	85.8	9.4	4.8
SD	5.6	3.4	2.5

Table B-9. The Quality of Life in Adult Education  
(n = 21).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	76.2	14.3	9.5
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	76.2	9.5	14.3
. a considerable amount about methodology	42.9	42.9	14.3
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	52.4	38.1	9.5
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	47.6	42.9	9.5
M	54.7	33.4	11.9
SD	14.8	16.0	2.7
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	52.4	42.8	4.8
. to write in a precise manner	57.9	26.3	15.8
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	61.9	23.8	14.3
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	33.3	47.6	19.0
M	51.4	35.1	13.5
SD	12.6	11.8	6.1



Table B-9. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	42.9	38.1	19.0
. to evaluate my academic performance	71.4	28.6	0.0
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	47.6	38.1	14.3
M	54.0	35.0	11.0
SD	15.2	5.4	9.9
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	66.7	14.3	19.0
. to assess education from my perspective of study	90.5	4.8	4.8
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	52.4	38.1	9.5
M	69.9	19.1	11.0
SD	19.2	17.1	7.2
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	61.9	23.8	14.3
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	85.7	9.5	4.8
. to combine various theoretical techniques	57.1	23.8	19.0
. to combine information from a number of sources	90.5	4.8	4.8
M	73.8	15.5	10.7
SD	16.7	9.8	7.1

Table B-9. (Cont'd.)

Item,	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	81.0	9.5	9.5
. to evaluate the subject area studied	71.4	23.8	4.8
. to examine my own learning critically	81.0	14.3	4.8
M	77.8	15.9	6.3
SD	5.5	7.2	2.7
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	76.2	9.5	14.3
. to value research in education	71.4	23.8	4.8
. to value the skills I have learned	61.9	33.3	4.8
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	81.0	14.3	4.8
. to value the Master of Education program	71.4	19.0	9.5
M	72.4	20.0	7.6
SD	7.0	9.1	4.2

Table B-9. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	76.2	19.0	4.8
. I enjoy being	52.4	42.9	4.8
. students are very friendly	71.4	23.8	4.8
. I really like to go each day	52.4	42.9	4.8
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	66.7	23.8	9.5
M	63.8	30.5	5.7
SD	10.7	11.5	2.1
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	4.8	9.5	85.7
. I feel restless	19.0	28.6	52.4
. I feel lonely	14.3	9.5	76.2
. I get upset	23.8	14.3	61.9
. I feel worried	14.3	9.5	76.2
M	15.2	14.3	70.5
SD	7.0	8.2	13.2

Table B-9. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	66.7	23.8	9.5
. people look up to me	23.8	61.9	14.3
. people care about what I think	76.2	19.0	4.8
. I am treated with respect	76.2	19.0	4.8
. people think a lot of me	33.3	66.7	0.0
. I feel important	33.3	61.9	4.8
. I feel proud of myself	80.0	20.0	0.0
. I get on well with other students in my class	95.2	4.8	0.0
M	60.6	34.6	5.0
SD	26.5	24.5	5.0
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	81.0	14.3	4.8
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	60.0	30.0	10.0
. I am a success as a student	90.5	9.5	0.0
. I learn to get along with other people	55.0	35.0	10.0
. other students accept me as I am	76.2	23.8	0.0
. I have learned to work hard	76.2	14.3	9.5
M	73.2	21.1	5.7
SD	13.2	10.0	4.8

Table B-9. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	85.7	9.5	4.8
. give me the marks I deserve	95.2	4.8	0.0
marks I deserve			
. take a personal interest	66.7	23.8	9.5
. help me to do my best	60.0	20.0	20.0
. are fair and just	85.7	4.4	9.5
. listen to what I say	85.7	9.5	4.8
I say			
M	79.8	12.0	8.2
SD	13.4	8.0	6.8
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my	85.7	14.3	0.0
work			
. I like to learn	85.7	14.3	0.0
. I acquired skills that will	85.7	9.5	4.8
be of use to me			
. I achieve a satisfactory	90.5	9.5	0.0
standard in my work			
. the things I learn will help	81.0	19.0	0.0
me in my life			
. I know how to cope with work	71.4	23.8	4.8
. I am given the chance to do	71.4	19.0	9.5
work that really interests me			
. I know I can do well enough	81.0	19.0	0.0
to be successful			
. the things I am taught are	85.7	9.5	4.8
worthwhile			
. the work I do is good	90.5	9.5	0.0
preparation for my future			
M	82.9	14.7	2.4
SD	6.8	5.2	3.3

Table B-10. The Quality of Life at Park Royal  
(n = 135).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	91.1	7.4	1.5
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	85.9	8.9	5.2
. a considerable amount about methodology	70.5	25.0	4.5
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	44.8	44.0	11.2
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	44.0	44.8	11.2
M	61.3	30.7	8.0
SD	20.5	17.1	3.6
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	81.5	16.3	2.2
. to write in a precise manner	76.3	20.0	3.7
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	69.6	25.2	5.2
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	63.7	31.1	5.2
M	72.8	23.1	4.1
SD	7.7	6.5	1.4

Table B-10. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	77.8	18.5	3.7
. to evaluate my academic performance	83.7	11.9	4.4
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	67.9	24.6	7.5
M	76.5	18.3	5.2
SD	7.9	6.3	1.1
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	76.3	20.0	3.7
. to assess education from the perspective of my study area	86.7	11.9	1.5
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	69.9	24.1	6.0
M	77.6	18.7	3.7
SD	8.4	6.2	2.2
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	77.8	18.5	3.7
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	88.1	10.4	1.5
. to combine various theoretical techniques	72.2	20.3	7.5
. to combine information from a number of sources	94.0	5.2	0.7
M	83.0	13.6	3.4
SD	9.8	6.9	3.0

Table B-10. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	85.2	10.4	4.4
. to evaluate the subject area studied	88.9	8.1	3.0
. to examine my own learning critically	85.9	8.1	5.9
M	86.7	8.9	4.4
SD	1.9	1.3	1.4
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	84.4	14.1	1.5
. to value research in education	82.8	14.9	2.2
. to value the skills I have learned	88.1	9.7	2.2
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	88.1	10.4	1.5
. to value the Master of Education Program in the Faculty of Education	84.2	14.3	1.5
M	85.5	12.7	1.8
SD	2.4	2.4	0.3



Table B-10. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	67.4	23.0	9.6
. I enjoy being	82.7	13.5	3.8
. students are very friendly	91.9	4.4	3.7
. I really like to go each day	72.2	23.3	4.5
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	85.9	11.9	2.2
M	80.0	15.2	4.8
SD	10.0	8.0	2.8
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	2.2	8.9	88.9
. I feel restless	6.7	18.5	74.8
. I feel lonely	3.0	12.6	84.4
. I get upset	7.4	11.1	81.5
. I feel worried	5.2	19.3	75.6
M	4.9	14.1	81.0
SD	2.2	4.6	5.9

Table B-10. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	82.2	15.6	2.2
. people look up to me	38.5	50.4	11.1
. people care about what I think	77.8	19.3	3.0
. I am treated with respect	87.4	11.9	0.7
. people think a lot of me	38.8	54.5	6.7
. I feel important	60.7	34.1	5.2
. I feel proud of myself	85.9	11.1	3.0
. I get on well with other students in my class	94.1	5.2	0.7
M	70.7	25.3	4.0
SD	22.0	18.8	3.5
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	91.1	7.4	1.5
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	77.8	16.3	5.9
. I am a success as a student	96.3	3.0	0.7
. I learn to get along with other people	64.9	29.9	5.2
. other students accept me as I am	88.1	11.1	0.7
. I have learned to work hard	72.2	22.6	5.3
M	81.7	15.1	3.2
SD	12.0	9.9	2.4

Table B-10. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	93.3	6.0	0.7
. give me the marks I deserve	91.9	5.9	2.2
. take a personal interest	82.2	12.6	5.2
. help me to do my best	77.8	17.0	5.2
. are fair and just	89.6	8.1	2.2
. listen to what I say	85.2	12.6	2.2
M	86.7	10.4	2.9
SD	6.0	4.4	1.8
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	88.1	8.2	3.7
. I like to learn	94.8	3.0	2.2
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	85.8	9.7	4.5
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	91.9	4.4	3.7
. the things I learn will help me in my life	76.3	16.3	7.4
. I know how to cope with work	87.4	6.7	5.9
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	82.8	10.4	6.7
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	93.3	4.4	2.2
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	85.1	10.4	4.5
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	80.7	13.3	5.9
M	86.6	8.7	4.7
SD	5.7	4.2	1.7

Table B-11. Quality of Life at Dundas/McMaster  
(n = 90).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	88.6	9.1	2.3
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	87.6	11.2	1.1
. a considerable amount about methodology	72.4	24.1	3.4
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	53.4	33.0	13.6
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	53.4	31.8	14.8
M	66.7	25.0	8.3
SD	16.5	10.0	6.9
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	78.7	19.1	2.2
. to write in a precise manner	80.5	13.8	5.7
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	73.9	20.5	5.7
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	66.3	25.8	7.9
M	74.9	19.8	5.3
SD	6.3	4.9	2.3

Table B-11. Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	77.3	15.9	6.8
. to evaluate my academic performance	83.1	11.2	5.6
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	67.0	26.1	6.8
M	75.8	17.7	6.4
SD	8.1	7.6	0.6
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	70.8	27.0	2.2
. to assess education from my perspective of study	88.9	7.9	2.2
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	69.7	23.6	6.7
M	76.5	19.5	3.7
SD	10.7	10.1	2.6
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	79.8	16.9	3.4
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	88.5	11.5	0.0
. to combine various theoretical techniques	70.5	26.1	3.4
. to combine information from a number of sources	92.1	4.5	3.4
M	82.7	14.8	2.5
SD	9.6	9.1	1.7

Table B-11. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	75.0	21.6	3.4
. to evaluate the subject area studied	92.0	6.9	1.1
. to examine my own learning critically	89.9	6.7	3.4
M	85.6	11.8	2.6
SD	9.2	8.5	1.3
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	89.8	8.0	2.3
. to value research in education	84.1	13.6	2.3
. to value the skills I have learned	91.0	6.7	2.2
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	91.0	7.9	1.1
. to value the Master of Education Program in the Faculty of Education	87.6	9.0	3.4
M	88.7	9.0	2.3
SD	2.9	2.6	0.8

Table B-11. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree%	Neutral%	Disagree%
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	80.9	12.4	6.7
. I enjoy being	80.9	18.0	1.1
. students are very friendly	83.1	14.6	2.2
. I really like to go each day	69.0	21.8	9.2
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	78.7	16.9	4.5
M	78.5	16.7	4.7
SD	5.5	3.5	3.3
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	3.4	5.6	91.0
. I feel restless	7.9	31.5	60.7
. I feel lonely	5.6	10.1	84.3
. I get upset	10.1	11.2	78.7
. I feel worried	10.1	13.5	76.4
M	7.4	14.4	78.2
SD	2.9	9.9	11.3

Table B-11. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	87.6	11.2	1.1
. people look up to me	40.4	47.2	12.4
. people care about what I think	82.0	15.7	2.2
. I am treated with respect	89.9	10.1	0.0
. people think a lot of me	48.3	47.2	4.5
. I feel important	61.8	32.6	5.6
. I feel proud of myself	89.9	7.9	2.2
. I get on well with other students in my class	95.5	4.5	0.0
M	74.4	22.1	3.5
SD	21.2	17.6	4.1
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	91.0	7.9	1.1
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	74.2	18.0	7.9
. I am a success as a student	95.5	3.4	1.1
. I learn to get along with other people	66.3	25.8	7.9
. other students accept me as I am	85.4	14.6	0.0
. I have learned to work hard	74.2	21.3	4.5
M	81.1	15.2	3.7
SD	11.3	8.3	3.5



Table B-11. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	94.4	4.5	1.1
. give me the marks I deserve	95.5	4.5	0.0
. take a personal interest	80.9	16.9	2.2
. help me to do my best	71.9	22.5	5.6
. are fair and just	91.0	7.9	1.1
. listen to what I say	86.5	11.2	2.2
M	86.7	11.3	2.0
SD	9.0	7.2	1.9
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	83.1	15.7	1.1
. I like to learn	94.4	5.6	0.0
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	88.6	9.1	2.3
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	95.5	4.5	0.0
. the things I learn will help me in my life	79.8	16.9	3.4
. I know how to cope with work	84.3	11.2	4.5
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	84.3	13.5	2.2
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	95.5	3.4	1.1
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	87.6	9.0	3.4
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	86.5	12.4	1.1
M	88.0	10.1	1.9
SD	5.5	4.6	1.5

Table B-12. Quality of Life at Brock (n = 119).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	84.0	11.8	4.2
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	87.4	9.2	3.4
. a considerable amount about methodology	76.5	16.0	7.6
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	59.7	28.6	11.8
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	56.3	33.6	10.1
M	70.0	21.9	8.2
SD	14.5	10.2	3.6
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	77.3	19.3	3.4
. to write in a precise manner	81.4	16.1	2.5
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	70.1	23.9	6.0
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	67.2	26.9	5.9
M	74.0	21.6	4.5
SD	6.5	4.7	1.7

Table B-12. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	77.3	19.3	3.4
. to evaluate my academic performance	84.9	13.4	1.7
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	70.6	21.8	7.6
M	77.6	18.2	4.2
SD	7.1	4.3	3.0
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	83.2	13.4	3.4
. to assess education from my perspective of study	84.9	12.6	2.5
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	73.9	19.3	6.7
M	80.7	15.1	4.2
SD	5.9	3.6	2.2
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	85.7	85.7	0.8
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	85.7	13.4	0.8
. to combine various theoretical techniques	71.2	22.0	6.8
. to combine information from a number of sources	89.1	10.1	0.8
M	82.9	14.7	2.3
SD	7.9	5.0	2.9

Table B-12. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	75.6	21.0	3.4
. to evaluate the subject area studied	87.4	11.8	0.8
. to examine my own learning critically	87.4	9.2	3.4
M	83.5	14.0	2.5
SD	6.8	6.2	1.5
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	79.7	15.3	5.1
. to value research in education	84.9	13.4	1.7
. to value the skills I have learned	86.6	12.6	0.8
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	87.4	9.2	3.4
. to value the Master of Education Program in the Faculty of Education	77.1	21.2	1.7
M	83.1	14.3	2.6
SD	4.5	4.4	1.7

Table B-12. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	63.9	22.7	13.4
. I enjoy being	70.9	23.9	5.1
. students are very friendly	75.6	20.2	4.2
. I really like to go each day	58.6	28.4	12.9
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	81.5	13.4	5.0
M	70.1	21.8	8.1
SD	9.1	5.5	4.6
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	2.5	4.2	93.3
. I feel restless	13.4	18.5	68.1
. I feel lonely	10.9	5.9	83.2
. I get upset	6.7	16.8	76.5
. I feel worried	12.7	12.7	74.6
M	9.2	11.6	79.1
SD	4.5	6.3	9.5

Table B-12. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	84.9	13.4	1.7
. people look up to me	36.1	41.2	22.7
. people care about what I think	78.2	20.2	1.7
. I am treated with respect	85.7	11.8	2.5
. people think a lot of me	42.0	46.2	11.8
. I feel important	54.6	41.2	4.2
. I feel proud of myself	86.6	11.8	1.7
. I get on well with other students in my class	89.1	10.1	0.8
M	69.7	24.5	5.9
SD	21.8	15.5	7.6
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	95.8	0.8	3.4
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	75.6	18.5	5.9
. I am a success as a student	95.8	4.2	0.0
. I learn to get along with other people	61.0	30.5	8.5
. other students accept me as I am	84.0	16.0	0.0
. I have learned to work hard	73.9	21.0	5.0
M	81.0	15.2	3.8
SD	21.8	15.5	7.6

Table B-12. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	85.6	13.6	0.8
. give me the marks I deserve	93.2	5.9	0.8
. take a personal interest	79.8	13.4	6.7
. help me to do my best	74.6	18.6	6.8
. are fair and just	90.8	8.4	0.8
. listen to what I say	88.2	10.9	0.8
M	85.4	11.8	2.8
SD	7.0	4.4	3.0
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	79.8	13.4	6.7
. I like to learn	91.6	8.4	0.0
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	87.3	10.2	2.5
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	97.5	2.5	0.0
. the things I learn will help me in my life	83.2	14.3	2.5
. I know how to cope with work	87.4	10.1	2.5
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	82.4	13.4	4.2
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	98.3	1.7	0.8
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	89.1	8.4	2.5
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	90.8	7.6	1.7
M	88.7	9.0	2.3
SD	6.1	4.3	2.0

Table B-13. Quality of Life at Seneca/Sheridan  
(n = 25).

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Overall Satisfaction			
. overall I am satisfied	72.0	20.0	8.0
Learning Satisfaction			
Cognitive			
Knowledge			
. a considerable amount about the subject	80.0	12.0	8.0
. a considerable amount about methodology	48.0	40.0	12.0
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	60.0	28.0	12.0
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional elements	64.0	24.0	12.0
M	63.0	26.0	11.0
SD	13.2	11.5	2.0
Comprehension			
. to communicate the subject matter clearly	60.0	32.0	8.0
. to write in a precise manner	62.5	20.5	16.7
. to plan appropriate presentation activities	68.0	20.0	12.0
. to speak in a clear and concise manner	44.0	36.0	20.0
M	58.6	27.2	14.2
SD	10.3	8.1	5.2



Table B-13. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Application			
. to present discussions in a systematic manner	56.0	24.0	20.0
. to evaluate my academic performance	76.0	24.0	0.0
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	48.0	28.0	24.0
M	60.0	25.3	14.7
SD	14.4	2.3	12.8
Analysis			
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	68.0	12.0	20.0
. to assess education from the perspective of my study area	88.0	4.0	8.0
. to analyze my area of study in terms of models	56.0	32.0	12.0
M	70.7	16.0	13.3
SD	16.1	14.4	6.1
Synthesis			
. to synthesize the various perspectives	64.0	20.0	16.0
. to combine elements of knowledge into new perspectives	88.0	8.0	4.0
. to combine various theoretical techniques	60.0	16.0	24.0
. to combine information from a number of sources	88.0	8.0	4.0
M	75.0	13.0	12.0
SD	15.1	6.0	9.8

Table B-13. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Evaluation			
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	76.0	12.0	12.0
. to evaluate the subject area studied	76.0	16.0	8.0
. to examine my own learning critically	84.0	12.0	4.0
M	78.7	13.3	8.0
SD	4.6	2.3	4.0
Affective			
Value Complex			
. to value myself as a graduate student	76.0	8.0	16.0
. to value research in education	76.0	16.0	8.0
. to value the skills I have learned	72.0	20.0	8.0
. to value things I have learned about my area of study	80.0	12.0	8.0
. to value the Master of Education Program in the Faculty of Education	76.0	16.0	8.0
M	76.0	14.4	9.6
SD	2.8	4.5	3.5

Table B-13. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Student Life Satisfaction			
Global Satisfaction			
Satisfaction			
. I find it easy to get to know other people	76.0	20.0	4.0
. I enjoy being	64.0	28.0	8.0
. students are very friendly	80.0	16.0	4.0
. I really like to go each day	56.5	39.1	4.3
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	58.3	29.2	12.5
M	67.0	26.4	6.5
SD	10.5	8.9	3.7
Dissatisfaction			
. I feel depressed	8.0	12.0	80.0
. I feel restless	16.0	20.0	64.0
. I feel lonely	8.3	8.3	83.3
. I get upset	25.0	8.3	66.7
. I feel worried	16.7	8.3	75.0
M	14.8	11.4	73.8
SD	7.0	5.0	8.3

Table B-13. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Domain Specific Satisfaction			
Status			
. I feel proud to be a student	60.0	28.0	12.0
. people look up to me	24.0	64.0	12.0
. people care about what I think	83.3	12.5	4.2
. I am treated with respect	80.0	16.0	4.0
. people think a lot of me	29.2	70.0	0.0
. I feel important	45.8	45.8	8.3
. I feel proud of myself	82.6	17.4	0.0
. I get on well with other students in my class	100.0	0.0	0.0
M	63.1	31.7	5.1
SD	27.8	25.4	5.1
Identity			
. the things I learn are important to me	84.0	8.0	8.0
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	73.9	17.4	8.7
. I am a success as a student	92.0	8.0	0.0
. I learn to get along with other people	47.0	30.4	21.7
. other students accept me as I am	87.5	12.5	0.0
. I have learned to work hard	70.8	12.5	16.7
M	75.9	14.8	9.2
SD	16.8	8.4	8.7

Table B-13. (Cont'd.)

Item	Percentage		
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Teachers			
. treat me fairly	76.0	16.0	8.0
. give me the marks I deserve	76.0	20.0	4.0
. take a personal interest	58.3	25.0	16.7
. help me to do my best	62.5	16.7	20.8
. are fair and just	79.2	12.5	8.3
. listen to what I say	83.3	12.5	4.2
M	72.6	17.1	10.3
SD	9.8	4.7	6.8
Opportunity			
. I really get involved in my work	88.0	8.0	4.0
. I like to learn	88.0	8.0	4.0
. I acquired skills that will be of use to me	83.3	12.5	4.2
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	92.0	8.0	0.0
. the things I learn will help me in my life	79.2	20.8	0.0
. I know how to cope with work	66.7	25.0	8.3
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	70.8	20.8	8.3
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	87.5	12.5	0.0
. the things I am taught are worthwhile	87.5	8.3	4.2
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	83.3	16.7	0.0
M	82.6	14.1	3.3
SD	8.1	6.3	3.2

Table B-14. Comparison of the Quality of Life in Master Programs.

Item	U of M		Brock	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Overall Satisfaction				
. overall I am satisfied	52.0	25.1	87.0	3.0
Learning Satisfaction				
Cognitive				
Knowledge				
. a considerable amount about subjects in my area of focus	47.5	28.3	86.4	3.8
. a considerable amount about methodology	51.7	21.0	71.4	5.8
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	56.0	24.7	53.1	12.0
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional aspects	44.5	30.8	51.5	11.7
M	49.9	26.2	65.6	8.3
SD	5.0	4.3	16.5	4.1
Comprehension				
. to communicate subject matter	49.5	19.9	78.0	3.0
. to write in a precise manner	48.4	30.8	78.1	4.6
. to plan appropriate learning	57.5	14.2	70.8	6.0
. to speak clearly and concisely	54.5	19.4	64.2	7.0
M	52.5	21.1	72.8	5.2
SD	4.3	6.9	6.6	1.7

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).

Table B-14. (Cont'd.)

Item	U of M		Brock	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Application				
. to present materials in a systematic manner	58.3	13.3	76.1	5.4
. to evaluate academic performances	48.8	22.1	83.5	3.5
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	65.3	12.8	67.3	8.4
M	57.5	16.1	75.6	5.7
SD	8.3	5.2	8.1	2.4
Analysis				
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	66.5	14.2	77.0	4.3
. to assess my area of focus	42.9	21.2	87.0	2.4
. to analyze my are of focus in terms of its models	46.8	21.4	70.0	6.8
M	52.1	18.9	78.0	4.5
SD	12.6	4.1	8.5	2.2
Synthesis				
. to synthesize various perspectives	56.2	17.8	79.7	3.5
. to combine elements of knowledge	55.9	15.3	87.4	1.1
. to combine various theoretical techniques	56.4	16.8	70.4	7.4
. to combine information	77.8	5.8	91.6	1.6
M	61.6	14.1	82.3	3.4
SD	10.8	5.5	9.3	2.8

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).

Table B-14. (Cont'd.)

Item	U of M		Brock	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Evaluation				
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	61.5	14.9	79.3	4.3
. to evaluate my subjects	53.2	17.4	88.3	2.2
. to examine my own area of focus critically	66.1	11.8	87.3	4.3
M	60.3	14.7	84.9	3.6
SD	6.5	2.8	4.9	1.2
Affective				
Value Complex				
. to value myself as ...	62.4	11.0	83.7	3.8
. to value research	73.1	10.1	83.4	2.4
. to value skills learned	57.9	9.5	87.2	2.2
M	64.5	10.2	84.8	2.8
SD	7.8	0.7	2.1	0.8

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).



Table B-14. (Cont'd.)

Item	U of M		Brock	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Student Life Satisfaction				
Global Satisfaction				
Satisfaction				
. I find it easy to get to know other people	64.8	11.9	69.9	9.8
. I get enjoyment being there	59.7	11.9	77.0	3.8
. students are very friendly	70.0	5.3	83.7	3.5
. I really like to go each day	46.2	14.7	66.1	8.3
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	63.6	10.5	81.0	4.3
M	60.9	10.9	75.5	5.9
SD	8.9	3.4	7.4	2.9
Dissatisfaction				
. I feel depressed	5.3	71.1	3.0	90.3
. I feel restless	16.4	58.7	9.8	68.6
. I feel lonely	7.6	69.8	6.5	84.0
. I get upset	10.6	58.6	9.0	78.3
. I feel worried	12.3	57.0	9.5	75.5
M	10.4	63.0	7.6	79.3
SD	4.2	6.8	2.8	8.2

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).

Table B-14. (Cont'd.)

Item	U of M		Brock	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Domain Specific Satisfaction				
Status				
. I feel proud to be a student	46.9	16.2	83.0	2.4
. people look up to me	21.2	23.9	37.1	15.4
. people care about what I think	69.0	6.6	79.3	2.4
. I am treated with respect	75.2	4.4	87.0	1.4
. people think a lot of me	34.4	8.8	41.4	7.6
. I feel important	41.9	10.6	57.9	5.1
. I feel proud of myself	64.9	3.1	86.9	2.2
. I get on well with other students in my class	87.2	0.0	93.2	0.5
M	55.1	9.2	70.7	4.6
SD	22.5	7.7	22.0	4.9
Identity				
. the things I learn are important to me	79.3	5.3	92.2	2.4
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	65.4	4.4	76.1	6.5
. I am a success as a student	90.3	0.4	95.7	0.5
. I learn to get along with other people	50.7	11.5	63.1	7.9
. other students accept me as I am	79.3	0.4	86.1	0.3
. I have learned to work hard	67.0	11.5	73.0	6.0
M	72.0	5.6	81.0	4.0
SD	13.8	5.0	12.4	3.2

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).

Table B-14. (Cont'd.)

Item	U of M		Brock	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Teachers				
. treat me fairly	78.9	5.3	89.9	1.4
. give me the marks I deserve	80.1	4.4	92.1	1.4
. take a personal interest	66.5	11.9	79.6	5.7
. help me to do my best	59.2	11.0	74.4	6.8
. are fair and just	77.1	5.3	89.7	1.9
. listen to what I say	71.9	5.7	86.4	1.9
M	72.3	7.3	85.3	3.2
SD	8.1	3.2	6.9	2.4
Opportunity				
. I really get involved in my work	77.2	6.1	84.2	4.1
. I like learning	78.0	4.8	93.2	1.1
. I have acquired skills that will be of use to me	74.8	9.7	86.8	3.3
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	88.1	1.8	94.6	1.4
. the things I learn will help me in my life	66.4	10.6	79.6	4.3
. I know how to cope with work	82.5	4.4	85.3	4.6
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	60.5	16.7	82.3	4.9
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	89.9	1.3	95.1	1.1
. the things I am taught are worthwhile learning	68.0	8.8	87.2	3.5
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	67.0	14.1	85.6	3.0
M	75.2	7.8	87.4	3.1
SD	9.7	5.1	5.2	1.4

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).

Table B-15. Comparison of the Quality of Life in the  
Faculty of Education, Brock University

Item	Pre-Service		Masters	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Overall Satisfaction				
. overall I am satisfied	76.3	8.4	87.0	3.0
Learning Satisfaction				
Cognitive				
Knowledge				
. a considerable amount about subjects in my area of focus	54.4	21.5	86.4	3.8
. a considerable amount about methodology	73.4	5.0	71.4	5.8
. a considerable amount about psychological aspects	59.5	12.7	53.1	12.0
. a considerable amount about socio-emotional aspects	57.0	15.2	51.5	11.7
M	61.1	13.6	65.6	8.3
SD	8.5	6.8	16.5	4.1
Comprehension				
. to communicate subject matter	70.7	12.1	78.0	3.0
. to write in a precise manner	34.6	30.8	78.1	4.6
. to plan appropriate learning	86.0	3.8	70.8	6.0
. to speak clearly and concisely	70.3	9.5	64.2	7.0
M	65.4	14.1	72.8	5.2
SD	21.8	11.6	6.6	1.7

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).

Table B-15. (Cont'd.)

Item	Pre-Service		Masters	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Application				
. to present materials in a systematic manner	58.3	13.3	76.1	5.4
. to evaluate academic performances	47.2	24.3	83.5	3.5
. to use a variety of theoretical strategies	89.9	0.6	67.3	8.4
M	65.1	12.7	75.6	5.7
SD	22.2	11.8	8.1	2.4
Analysis				
. to analyze theoretical perspectives	60.9	7.1	77.0	4.3
. to assess my area of focus	75.3	4.1	87.0	2.4
. to analyze my area of focus in terms of models	56.4	9.0	70.0	6.8
M	64.2	6.7	78.0	4.5
SD	9.8	2.4	8.5	2.2
Synthesis				
. to synthesize various perspectives	63.5	7.1	79.7	3.5
. to combine elements of knowledge	59.6	7.7	87.4	1.1
. to combine various theoretical techniques	84.8	1.9	70.4	7.4
. to combine information	77.8	6.3	91.6	1.6
M	71.4	5.7	82.3	3.4
SD	11.8	2.6	9.3	2.8

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).

Table B-15. (Cont'd.)

Item	Pre-Service		Masters	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Evaluation				
. to evaluate theoretical perspectives	55.8	8.4	79.3	4.3
. to evaluate my subjects	61.4	13.9	88.3	2.2
. to examine my own area of focus critically	90.5	0.0	87.3	4.3
M	69.2	7.4	84.9	3.6
SD	18.6	7.0	4.9	1.2
Affective				
Value Complex				
. to value myself as ...	85.4	1.9	83.7	3.8
. to value research	50.0	13.3	83.4	2.4
. to value skills learned	77.1	2.5	87.2	2.2
M	70.8	5.9	84.8	2.8
SD	18.5	6.4	2.1	0.8

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).

Table B-15. (Cont'd.)

Item	Pre-Service		Masters	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Student Life Satisfaction				
Global Satisfaction				
Satisfaction				
. I find it easy to get to know other people	76.6	3.8	69.9	9.8
. I get enjoyment being there	75.9	9.5	77.0	3.8
. students are very friendly	86.7	0.6	83.7	3.5
. I really like to go each day	66.9	7.6	66.1	8.3
. I find that learning is a lot of fun	73.9	7.0	81.0	4.3
M	76.0	5.7	75.5	5.9
SD	7.1	3.5	7.4	2.9
Dissatisfaction				
. I feel depressed	2.5	87.3	3.0	90.3
. I feel restless	16.7	59.6	9.8	68.6
. I feel lonely	3.8	85.4	6.5	84.0
. I get upset	5.1	70.5	9.0	78.3
. I feel worried	8.3	71.3	9.5	75.5
M	7.3	74.8	7.6	79.3
SD	5.6	11.5	2.8	8.2

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).

Table B-15. (Cont'd.)

Item	Pre-Service		Masters	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Domain Specific Satisfaction				
Status				
. I feel proud to be a student	82.3	4.4	83.0	2.4
. people look up to me	57.4	9.0	37.1	15.4
. people care about what I think	76.4	4.5	79.3	2.4
. I am treated with respect	88.0	2.5	87.0	1.4
. people think a lot of me	59.9	3.8	41.4	7.6
. I feel important	67.3	3.8	57.9	5.1
. I feel proud of myself	81.5	1.9	86.9	2.2
. I get on well with other students in my class	90.4	0.6	93.2	0.5
M	75.4	3.8	70.7	4.6
SD	12.5	2.5	22.0	4.9
Identity				
. the things I learn are important to me	86.1	3.8	92.2	2.4
. mixing with others helps me to understand myself	70.9	5.1	76.1	6.5
. I am a success as a student	92.4	1.3	95.7	0.5
. I learn to get along with other people	75.0	3.2	63.1	7.9
. other students accept me as I am	88.5	0.6	86.1	0.3
. I have learned to work hard	53.5	16.5	73.0	6.0
M	77.7	5.1	81.0	4.0
SD	14.4	5.8	12.4	3.2

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).



Table B-15. (Cont'd.)

Item	Pre-Service		Masters	
	A, %	D, %	A, %	D, %
Teachers				
. treat me fairly	83.5	5.8	89.9	1.4
. give me the marks I deserve	76.6	7.6	92.1	1.4
. take a personal interest	80.4	5.1	79.6	5.7
. help me to do my best	72.0	4.5	74.4	6.8
. are fair and just	80.9	4.4	89.7	1.9
. listen to what I say	80.3	3.2	86.4	1.9
M	79.0	5.1	85.3	3.2
SD	4.0	1.5	6.9	2.4
Opportunity				
. I really get involved in my work	75.9	5.7	84.2	4.1
. I like learning	81.6	5.7	93.2	1.1
. I have acquired skills that will be of use to me	82.3	4.4	86.8	3.3
. I achieve a satisfactory standard in my work	90.5	1.9	94.6	1.4
. the things I learn will help me in my life	75.9	7.6	79.6	4.3
. I know how to cope with work	79.6	1.9	85.3	4.6
. I am given the chance to do work that really interests me	59.9	10.8	82.3	4.9
. I know I can do well enough to be successful	92.4	1.3	95.1	1.1
. the things I am taught are worthwhile learning	71.3	9.5	87.2	3.5
. the work I do is good preparation for my future	73.2	9.5	85.6	3.0
M	78.3	5.8	87.4	3.1
SD	9.4	3.4	5.2	1.4

Note: (A = Agree; D = Disagree).